



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 109th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 152

WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, JULY 11, 2006

No. 89

House of Representatives

The House met at 9 a.m.

MORNING HOUR DEBATES

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 31, 2006, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning hour debates. The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to not to exceed 25 minutes, and each Member except the majority leader, the minority leader or the minority whip limited to not to exceed 5 minutes, but in no event shall debate extend beyond 9:50 a.m.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) for 5 minutes.

ARMY RECRUITMENT

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

As the cost of the war in Iraq climbs past \$300 billion, and there are estimates that suggest the total financial cost will far exceed \$1 trillion, there is another cost that is less measurable but no less significant: that is the stress on the military itself and the consequences for our fighting men and women, for innocent Iraqis, and the capacity of our Armed Forces far into the future.

The Pentagon has announced that the Army has met its recruiting goals for the 13th consecutive month, but we are seeing an erosion in the quality of recruits in our Armed Forces as more and more young Americans who disagree with what we are doing in Iraq have chosen to stay away. In order to meet recruiting targets, the Army has relaxed restrictions against high school dropouts and have started letting in more applicants who score in the lowest third on the Armed Forces aptitude test, a group known as category 4 recruits. Since the mid 1980s, category 4

recruits were kept, as a matter of policy, to less than 2 percent of all recruits. But by the end of 2005, the percentage of recruits who fell under this lowest category has reached double digits.

In my district, not only has the Army lowered its standards but recruiters have been pushed to violate the remaining standards in order to meet these recruiting targets. We have had two examples of where autistic young men have been recruited into the Army despite the regulations. As I have discussed on the floor of the House how outrageous this was, indeed, one of these young men did not even know that there was a war going on in Iraq. This all has terrible consequences for our efforts against the global war on terror.

This weekend's papers were full of articles and editorials about the role that our lowered recruiting standards may have played in the recent spate of reports of servicemembers being accused of atrocities in Iraq. What does this tell us about our efforts to eliminate the insurgency and win the hearts and minds of people in the Middle East?

We must also consider the long-term cost to our national security and to the military itself. These lower standards are impacting the Army's capacities and will continue to do so for at least a generation into the future.

There was a RAND Corporation study last fall that showed replacing a gunner who had scored 3A on the aptitude test with one who scored that category 4 that I mentioned a moment ago, reduced the chances of hitting targets by 34 percent. In another study, 84 three-man teams from the Army's active duty signal battalions were given the task of making a communications system operational, what you need to do in a theater of battle. Teams consisting of the category 3A had a 67 percent chance of succeeding. Those with category 4 personnel had only a 29 percent

chance. More than two-thirds to barely more than a quarter.

There is also damage to the reputation of the good name of the United States military. We are intensely proud of the young men and women who have served under such difficult circumstances. It is not fair for their hard work and heroic efforts to be tainted by the action of others or for their job to be made more difficult or more dangerous due to substandard soldiers who are finding their way into the Armed Forces. When we lower recruitment standards or recruit those who have no business in the military at all, the consequences will be felt by our military in Iraq today and by the entire Nation for years to come.

One of the reasons it is imperative to have a sensible plan to scale down and transition our activities in Iraq, handing them over to the Iraqis, themselves, is to stop this erosion of our military capacity that has occurred because of the sadly inept management of the occupation by this administration and the Secretary of Defense. There was never a doubt about our winning the war in Iraq. They just weren't prepared to win the peace.

Our young men and women in the armed services deserve for us to get it right, because their lives are at stake. And we owe it to every American, because there are dangerous people around the world and the integrity of the military is critical to our fight to protect America.

FANNIE LOU HAMER, ROSA PARKS, AND CORETTA SCOTT KING VOTING RIGHTS ACT REAUTHORIZATION AND AMENDMENTS ACT OF 2006, H.R. 9

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. DRAKE). Pursuant to the order of the House of January 31, 2006, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BUTTERFIELD) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H4963

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker, it is my understanding that the House leadership has agreed to bring to the floor this week the Fannie Lou Hamer, Rosa Parks, and Coretta Scott King Voting Rights Act Reauthorization and Amendments Act of 2006. I want to thank the Speaker and the majority leader for their willingness to go forward with this debate prior to our upcoming recess.

Madam Speaker, the 1965 Voting Rights Act changed America. It created the opportunity for minority citizens to fully participate in democracy. Prior to the enactment and enforcement of the act, black citizens in the South were disenfranchised, primarily because of the literacy tests and because of the design of election systems that submerged concentrations of black voters into large, majority-white election districts. The result was that African-American communities could not elect candidates of their choice to office.

Why? It was because black voters did not comprise sufficient numbers within the district and white voters refused to vote for candidates who were the choice of the minority community. And so the votes of black citizens were diluted, which is a clear violation of the principle of one-person, one-vote.

The Voting Rights Act permits minority citizens to bring Federal lawsuits when they feel their vote is being diluted. Hundreds of these lawsuits have been successfully litigated in the Federal courts. In my prior life, I was a voting rights attorney in North Carolina. As a result of court ordered remedies, local jurisdictions have been required to create election districts that do not dilute minority voting strength. When I was in law school 32 years ago, there were virtually no black elected officials in my congressional district. Today, I count 302.

The Voting Rights Act also requires some jurisdictions to obtain Department of Justice pre-clearance to any change in election procedure. This, at first blush, may appear to be unfair to those jurisdictions, but the jurisdictions that are covered have a significant history of vote dilution and this requirement of pre-clearance simply assures that the jurisdiction does not intentionally or unintentionally make changes in their election procedures that will discriminate. This is called section 5. Section 5 has prevented many, many election changes that would have disenfranchised minority voters. It serves a useful purpose and should be extended.

A short story, Madam Speaker, and then I will close. In 1953 in my hometown of Wilson, NC, the African-American community worked very hard to teach the literacy test and qualify black citizens to vote. They then organized and elected an African American to the city council in a district with a large concentration of black voters. That was big news. When it was time

for reelection in 1957, the city council, arbitrarily and without notice or debate, changed the election system from district voting to at-large voting which resulted in the submerging of black voters. The change also required voters to vote for all city council seats on the ballot. If not, the ballot was considered spoiled. It was called the "vote for six rule."

Needless to say, that candidate, Dr. G.K. Butterfield, was handily defeated. If section 5 had been in place in 1957, this jurisdiction would not have been able to implement the changes and this community would have continued to have representation.

Madam Speaker, we have made tremendous progress in this country with respect to civil rights and voting rights. We must not turn back. I urge my colleagues on Thursday to vote for another 25-year extension of section 5 of the Voting Rights Act and require covered jurisdictions to get the Department of Justice to analyze the voting change to determine if it will have the effect of diluting minority voting strength.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until 10 a.m. today.

Accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 12 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess until 10 a.m.

□ 1000

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. KUHLMANN of New York) at 10 a.m.

PRAYER

The Reverend J. Cletus Kiley, President, The Faith & Politics Institute, Washington D.C., offered the following prayer:

O God, we bow our heads humbly, gathered in this hallowed Chamber at the beginning of a new day. Here, in this place, our faith and our politics meet. Our work is about the just ordering of our society. And so at the beginning of this day we beg a portion of Your spirit that we might fully understand the authentic requirements that such a just society demands.

We beg a fuller portion of Your spirit to strengthen us so that our work is always at the service of love, and thus, in the face of human suffering, we may become a consolation; where there is isolation, we may become community; where there is need, we may become abundance; where there is threat, we may become strength.

Today, O God, stretch us beyond our personal limits that we might fulfill Your divine plan and may serve the common good of our people. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. KUCINICH led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

DEMOCRATS HAVE A LACKLUSTER RECORD ON BORDER SECURITY

(Ms. FOXX asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, House Democrats have been talking a lot about their agenda lately, but each and every time they fail to mention border security or immigration reform, and I suppose for good reason. With their lackluster record on immigration reform, I can understand why they hesitate to bring up the issue.

After all, Republicans voted to pass a border security bill in December, but Democrats, led by their minority leader, opposed the bill. Republicans voted to pass the REAL ID Act to make sure people who receive driver's licenses are here legally, but Democrats, led by their minority leader, opposed the bill.

Republicans wanted to allow members of our Armed Forces to help perform certain border security protection functions, but Democrats, led by their minority leader, opposed the amendment.

With a record like this, it is no wonder that the Democrats never mention border security as a part of their agenda.

DEPARTMENT OF PEACE AND NONVIOLENCE

(Mr. KUCINICH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, 5 years ago today, on July 11, I introduced legislation to create a Cabinet-level Department of Peace and Nonviolence, which would employ the principles taught by Christ, Gandhi, Dr. King, Mother Teresa and others to create a new hope for violence-free homes, schools and communities through peace and character education, a new hope that through peace education we can even challenge the notion of the inevitability of war.

Today, thanks to hundreds of community groups, led by The Peace Alliance, momentum is building. Fifteen

cities have passed resolutions endorsing a Department of Peace, and 74 Members of the House have signed on to the bill. More and more, Americans want a compassionate, focused, organized approach to dealing with the violence in our communities, to dealing with domestic violence, spousal abuse, child abuse and other types of violence. The Department of Peace represents the end of fear and the beginning of hope for a new Nation and a new world.

OUR BATTLE FOR THE BORDER

(Mr. POE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. POE. Mr. Speaker, more news from the front. Our battle for the border continues, and so does the hypocrisy from El Presidente Generalissimo Fox. So intent on tearing down American barriers, he is more intent on building his own, and he has taken millions of U.S. taxpayer dollars to do it.

For years, Fox has taken American money as part of Operation BusBound, a joint U.S.-Mexican venture, to send illegal immigrants coming from Central America, going to Fox's southern border, and he wants to send them back home. But he wails when we, the United States, use our own money for our own southern borders, securing it with our troops who aren't even carrying weapons.

However, Guatemalans, trying to illegally enter Mexico, just trying to take jobs Mexicans won't do, are reportedly met at the border with machete-wielding farmers and armed Mexican military. The old sly Fox is trying to protect his hen house while continuing to illegally enter ours.

Why is the United States helping to protect the borders of other Nations while lacking the moral will to protect our own? This ought not to be, but, Mr. Speaker, that is just the way it is.

MINIMUM WAGE AND RISING PRICES

(Mr. MORAN of Virginia asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, over the last 9 years gas prices have doubled; college prices are up 38 percent; food prices, up 20 percent; housing, up 25 percent; and health care costs, up a whopping 75 percent. But the minimum wage hasn't budged over that period of time.

Over the last 5 years, we have had a singular focus in this House on raising revenue for those families for whom these numbers really don't mean much, because they have so much disposable income. But for people on the minimum wage, it means they have to decide between putting food on the table or insuring their own children. They have to work a week just to fill their tank with gas.

That's not right, and isn't it time that the Republican Party stop block-

ing the Democrat's attempts to raise the minimum wage and recognize that it is the working class families who are providing the underpinning of this economy? Let's increase the minimum wage. It is the right thing to do.

BORDER SECURITY

(Mr. HAYWORTH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I listened with interest to the comments of my friend from Virginia, and perhaps at a later time, he can elaborate on what he said at a town hall meeting recently where he was quoted as saying he looked forward to earmarking the heck out of future spending bills, should his party take control.

Mr. Speaker, I come to the floor today to talk about the border security hearings we held last week in California and Texas. I attended the hearing in California and noted with interest the comments of Sheriff Rick Flores of Webb County, Texas, who said in response to our questions that the first goal of this government, and our first priority, should be enforcement of the law and enforcement of our borders.

Mr. Speaker, that is a clear message. The American people likewise want to see enforcement first, no tricks, no triggers, no amnesty, enforcing existing laws and closing loopholes to reaffirm that our great Republic is, in fact, a nation of laws.

RAISING CONCERNS ABOUT THE ECONOMY

(Mr. EMANUEL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. EMANUEL. Mr. Speaker, in July of 2001, a few months after President Bush took office, gas was \$1.33 a gallon. Five years later, July 2006, it has more than doubled to \$3.00, and in places like Chicago, it is as high as \$3.40 a gallon.

But this is not the only place where the administration has failed middle-class families. Since 2000, the cost of health care has increased 73 percent to \$11,000 for a family of four. The cost of tuition at a 4-year public college has increased 38 percent since 2001 and, at the same time, average weekly earnings have declined by 1 percent in America.

So while costs spiral out of control, middle-class families have less money in their pockets. That is not exactly what I would call a record of achievement. Yet today, the President said the economy is strong and getting stronger. The American people know that such statements are wrong and getting wronger. The President's statements show how out of touch he is with the struggles and challenges American families face today.

Mr. Speaker, all is not well on Main Street. It is high time that Washington and this Congress took action. It is

time for a new direction. It is time for a change.

SENATE IMMIGRATION BILL RESTRICTS POLICE

(Mr. MCHENRY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MCHENRY. Mr. Speaker, the Washington Times reported today that a Senate immigration bill, the Kennedy bill, would prohibit State and local police from helping Immigration and Customs Enforcement officials combat illegal immigration. The Senate bill bars State and local police from detaining aliens simply for being in the U.S. illegally. Police could arrest the aliens only if they commit certain additional violations of Federal immigration law.

So the Senate bill wants to base our national security on get-out-of-jail-free cards and second chances? Let me remind you, Mr. Speaker, that four of the September 11 hijackers committed immigration violations and had been stopped by State and local police before the attacks on our Nation. Just 2 days before September 11, one hijacker, who had overstayed his visa, was stopped and given a \$270 speeding ticket. That was later found in his rented car in the Newark airport just a couple of days after September 11.

Mr. Speaker, those who don't learn from their mistakes are destined to repeat them. The Kennedy bill in the Senate does just that.

EYE-POPPING FIGURES FOR EXTENDING MEDICARE PART D ENROLLMENT

(Mr. BISHOP of New York asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BISHOP of New York. Mr. Speaker, eye-popping figures in the new GAO report just made the case for extending the Medicare part D enrollment deadline a great deal more compelling.

Exhibit A, insurance providers failed to answer phone calls accurately in response to 70 percent of the questions asked by seniors about their benefit.

Exhibit B, call centers underestimated out-of-pocket costs seniors have to pay by thousands of dollars.

Exhibit C, like the insurance providers, Medicare operators often answered questions incorrectly according to an earlier GAO report.

You would figure the extra \$400 billion added to the initial price tag of the Medicare bill that the CMS actuaries didn't want to tell us about would at least buy seniors some peace of mind. Instead, part D continues to confuse and frustrate the seniors who, through no fault of their own, have a 3-in-10 chance of receiving the right information about their options.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I encourage my colleagues to help extend the enrollment deadline, repeal the sign-up

penalty, and repeal the provision locking seniors into a plan for a year once they sign up, so that they won't have to pay for the consequences of a bad bill for the rest of their lives.

NORTH KOREAN MISSILE LAUNCH

(Mr. MILLER of Florida asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, on America's birthday, North Korean leader Kim Jong Il thought it was wise to fire six ballistic missiles. The international community condemned these launches, and Kim Jong Il responded by firing an additional missile on July 5.

Having been to North Korea in 2003, I can tell you that their government does nothing for its people and uses blackmail as its primary foreign policy tool. Kim Jong Il and some of our opponents on the other side of the aisle believe that if North Korea fires missiles that it should be rewarded with direct talks and various forms of assistance. I don't believe in blackmail or rewarding bad behavior.

As President Bush has said recently about Kim Jong Il, he can verifiably get rid of his weapons programs, stop testing rockets, and there is a way forward to help his people. The choice is his to make.

Our military and intelligence professionals, along with our allies in this region, will continue to keep a close watch on North Korea. I have confidence in their abilities.

But let us not forget the 37,000 servicemembers and their families currently stationed in South Korea. I thank them for what they do and wish them continued safety in such close proximity to a despotic and unstable self-appointed leader.

CONTROL OF OUR BORDERS

(Mr. BERRY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, I couldn't agree more with my colleague from Arizona when he says the number one priority is control of our borders. I find it interesting that my colleague from Texas says that it is the President of Mexico's fault. The fact is, over the last 5 years, the Republicans in the Bush administration and in this House have refused to properly fund border security programs. Today we are seeing the results.

Mr. Speaker, with the proposal that President Bush made for massive amnesty and other programs to allow people to come into this country, it has just encouraged the difficult situation. But the bottom line remains, we must get control of our borders, and to do that we have to fund it.

Over and over again, the Republicans on the Appropriations Committee and

in this House have refused to provide adequate resources so we can do the job. It is time that we get the job done.

□ 1015

ILLEGAL ENTRY

(Mrs. BLACKBURN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to invite the Senate to join the House in debating how we are going to address illegal entry into this country. We are hearing from our colleagues today reporting back on the hearings that we are holding around the country, talking with sheriffs, talking with Border Patrol, talking to people on the ground.

We are hearing the same thing: stop illegal crossings. It is time. Get this problem under control.

Mr. Speaker, in this environment every State is a border State and every town is a border town. Meanwhile, the other body holds hearings talking about everything under the sun related to immigration except the actual process by which people come into this country illegally.

Until our colleagues across the Capitol are willing to admit illegal entry is the problem, we are going to continue seeing a debate that goes nowhere. We should address the problem. Illegal entry is the biggest problem, and then take on the next angle of the issue, and do it in an orderly process.

That is what our House leadership is saying, and they are right on the issue.

RAISE MINIMUM WAGE TODAY

(Mr. BUTTERFIELD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, House Republicans have a chance to give more than 6 million Americans a much-deserved pay raise. Would you believe that the minimum wage has not been increased in 9 years? It is the second longest amount of time that hardworking Americans have had to go without a pay raise, resulting in the hourly wage being at its lowest level in 50 years.

House Democrats want to expand economic opportunity for all Americans. We want to increase the minimum wage from \$5.15 an hour to \$7.25. It is only fair. These workers play by the rules every day. All they want in return is to make a living wage.

Do my Republican colleagues really believe that \$5.15 an hour is still a living wage? House Republicans claim that the only people who make the minimum wage are teenagers. Wrong.

Mr. Speaker, 75 percent of minimum wage workers are either the sole or one of two breadwinners in the family. House Republicans also like to claim that if we increase the minimum wage,

jobs will be lost. Wrong again. Today in the States that mandate a higher minimum wage, job growth has actually gotten higher. No more excuses.

CRACKING DOWN ON ONLINE PREDATORS

(Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of legislation that could protect innocent children across our great Nation. H.R. 5319, the Deleting Online Predators Act, introduced by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FITZPATRICK), gives parents, teachers and school officials new tools in their effort to protect our children from online sexual predators.

Just this week back in my district in Tavares, Florida, prosecutors are picking a jury to try the case of John Couey, the man accused of raping and killing 9-year-old Jessica Lunsford.

Sexual predators like John Couey not only stalk our children on the playground and at the mall, but also over the Internet on Web sites like MySpace.com.

I commend the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FITZPATRICK) for bringing attention to these Internet predators and thank the Energy and Commerce Committee for holding hearings on this bill.

ENERGY SOLUTIONS NEEDED

(Ms. WATSON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, all summer the American people have been facing record prices every time they go to the gas pump. Some have cut vacation plans, others are pinching their monthly paychecks attempting to make ends meet. Washington should be acting to pass a comprehensive energy package that relieves pain at the pump and reduces our dependence on foreign oil.

Unfortunately, House Republicans have refused to act on any substantial energy legislation this year. How bad do things have to get before House Republicans are finally willing to act? Instead of actually coming up with real solutions, House Republicans prefer the status quo. They refuse to act because of their cozy relationship with Big Oil and see no problem with the \$16 billion in profit the three largest oil companies reported during the first quarter of the year.

Mr. Speaker, while House Republicans are content with the status quo, Democrats are ready to take America in a new direction. We will stand up to Big Oil and protect consumers from price gouging.

TAKING CARE OF OUR MILITARY FAMILIES

(Mr. ISSA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Speaker, the district work period was especially meaningful for me going back to my district, Camp Pendleton being the center of it, and having a Fourth of July celebration in recognition of what our men and women in uniform have done and continue to do for our freedom and freedom around the world.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today very concerned that in fact the tendency to put the mission first is beginning to affect adversely the welfare and well-being of the families of our servicemen back home. We have had record supplementals and record payments on defense.

Mr. Speaker, we need to make sure that the funds that we earmark and put toward military construction, family housing units and the health and welfare of our men and women's wives, husbands and children get to them.

Mr. Speaker, I hope this body will work with the Department of Defense to ensure that those funds are maintained at the level that we put them in. It is essential that our fighting men and women away in combat know their families are taken care of at home.

NEGOTIABLE DRUG PRICES

(Mr. LANGEVIN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Speaker, it has been 6 months since the Republican prescription drug plan went into effect, and we are seeing prices shoot up faster than they have in 6 years. That's right, prices have increased by almost 4 percent in the last 6 months. Weren't Republicans promising prices would actually go down after their plan took effect?

The reason drug prices are not falling is because the Republican law forbids the Federal Government from using the purchasing power of 40 million seniors to actually negotiate for lower prices, an issue I raised when this prescription drug plan was first taken up by this House. That is exactly what the Veterans Administration does for America's veterans.

According to a report released last month, veterans' drug bills are 43 percent lower than seniors' bills as a result.

Well, today, thanks to a Republican plan that was written here in the back rooms by the pharmaceutical industry, these companies can charge our seniors any price they want. Unlike our Republican colleagues, House Democrats actually want to help our seniors. We want to give the Federal Government the ability to negotiate for lower prices, something that is good for our

seniors and good for the American taxpayer.

PRESIDENT BUSH DEMONSTRATES RESOLVE AGAINST NORTH KOREA

(Mr. WILSON of South Carolina asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, as Americans celebrated their liberties on the Fourth of July, the dictator of North Korea threatened the peace and stability of free nations throughout the world. I visited Pyongyang with Congressman JEFF MILLER, and I know that by test launching seven missiles into the Sea of Japan, Kim Jong-Il and his regime clearly disregarded North Korea's prior agreements.

As our country continues to fight the global war on terrorism, our allies cannot allow an unpredictable rogue leader to proceed with his quest for nuclear weapons. We must continue to work for a peaceful solution to this conflict, and we must hold North Korea accountable to their nonproliferation agreements.

I strongly support President Bush's efforts of diplomacy and an antiballistic missile defense system to protect the American people. As President Reagan said over 20 years ago, we must achieve peace through strength.

In conclusion, God bless our troops and we will never forget September 11.

DOING HALF THE JOB

(Mr. McDERMOTT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, one of my colleagues just came back from Iraq. He brought with him a quote from a Special Ops officer who is operating in that country. This man said this: "We are not going to kill our way to victory."

Now, if you look at what has gone on in the last 5 years, this Congress has allowed the President to go into Afghanistan, do half the job, cut and run to go to Iraq to a war that had no purpose. They took out Saddam Hussein, the President landed on the Abraham Lincoln and said "Mission Accomplished."

In fact he was right, they got rid of Saddam, but they have been fighting a war of occupation for 4 years. When the President landed on the Abraham Lincoln, 141 people had died; and now, 2,400 more have died in this war of occupation with no plan to end it, no plan to get out of it, and no end in sight.

This President should be taken out of office. We can't do that, but there is an election coming in November of this year to take out the Republican leadership of the House.

PROTECTING OUR CHILDREN

(Mrs. BIGGERT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1

minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. BIGGERT. Mr. Speaker, today the House Energy and Commerce Committee will take up H.R. 5319, the Deleting Online Predators Act of 2006, sponsored by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FITZPATRICK).

As an original cosponsor of the measure, I urge my colleagues to give it their strongest support. As a mother and grandmother, like other parents, I am horrified by the statistics.

Mr. Speaker, 20 percent of young people have been approached online with unwanted sexual advances. Naperville, Illinois, a city in my district that has twice been voted by Money magazine as the top city in the Nation to raise children, has witnessed two high-profile cases in the past 2 months. Thanks to the Naperville police and the Illinois State Police, the two crimes were uncovered before the predators met the children.

In Michigan, one minor had traveled halfway around the world to meet a man in the West Bank town of Jericho that she met on the networking Web site MySpace.com.

As children, many of us were taught never to talk to strangers. As parents and grandparents, our message must change with technology to include strangers on the Internet.

IMMIGRATION POLICY

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, let me ask the American people how much they love America, I know Americans love America giving all that they can give, an America that has opened her heart and mind to immigrants from all over the world and built a great nation, an America where everyone is proud because we have welcomed those from around the world who have fled oppression and persecution.

Why, then, do my friends on the other side of the aisle want to have the scapegoat-and-run policy for immigration, and that is refusing to stand and address the question that we all have come from somewhere and contributed to this Nation. And then, of course, we want to secure our homeland because we love America.

Why don't we have meetings, or a conference committee meeting in order to address the House and Senate bill so that Americans know that we care about securing their homeland; but yes, we recognize that the Irish and the Polish and those who come from Hispanic origins or Africa or the Caribbean or European heritage have all made this country great.

A pathway to citizenship, border security, not scapegoat and run, that is what America is all about. They want leadership and courage; they don't want anyone who stands for doing nothing.

□ 1030

TRIBUTE TO DOROTHY ROTH

(Mr. DENT asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to a constituent of mine who passed away recently.

Born in South Africa, Dorothy Roth was an extraordinary woman whom I first met while canvassing her neighborhood in the city of Allentown 17 years ago. She immediately invited me into her home to discuss public policy and politics. Accepting that invitation would be among the best decisions I made in my public service life.

But that was by no means the last visit to Dorothy Roth's home by me. After I was in office, occasionally Dorothy would invite me over for a discussion over tea and hors d'oeuvres. Dorothy praised me when she thought I was doing right, and she never hesitated to admonish me when she thought I was wrong or wasn't helping enough to advance worthy ideas or issues. When Dorothy found a cause, there truly was no better champion.

Dorothy gushed with pride about her children and her grandchildren. She loved her country and her community. She expected a lot of us in public service, but she expected even more from herself.

Dorothy had a generous spirit and epitomized what a good citizen should be. More importantly, she was a great person.

SECURING OUR BORDERS HAS NOT BEEN A PRIORITY OF REPUBLICANS IN WASHINGTON

(Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, after September 11, we all concluded that securing our borders was a top priority. Unfortunately, for the past 5 years the Republican majority here in Washington, from the White House to Capitol Hill, have refused to adequately fund border needs.

As a Congress, we promised to add 2,000 Border Patrol agents, 8,000 additional detention beds, and to add 800 more immigration investigators every year between 2005 and 2009. Two years into that promise, we are falling exceedingly short. House Republicans have cut \$48 million from Customs and Border Security Protection; and Democrats tried to restore the funding, but we were rebuffed by the Republican majority.

It is bad enough that Washington Republicans refuse to properly fund border security measures, but now it appears they are unwilling to work together to negotiate a final border security and immigration bill this year.

The only way we will secure our borders is if House and Senate Republicans stop playing games, stop holding press

conferences disguised as hearings, and actually sit down and hammer out a compromise. It is time to start fishing and stop cutting bait.

SECURING AMERICA'S BORDERS

(Mr. HENSARLING asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, the horrific 9/11 attacks on America taught us that border security is homeland security. But just last year, Customs and the Border Patrol stopped over 1 million people who illegally crossed our border. And of that 1 million, 160,000 were from countries other than Mexico, including Afghanistan, Iran, Iraq, Pakistan and Saudi Arabia.

Last week, expert witnesses at an International Relations subcommittee field hearing in Laredo, Texas, testified that unlike in years past, many illegal immigrants who sneak across the border are no longer good people who are simply in search of honest work, but rather, increasingly, they are criminals who belong to violent gangs and drug cartels.

Reynaldo Gaza, the Border Patrol chief in Laredo, testified that he worries now about the links between the drug cartels and the terrorists.

Hundreds of illegal immigrants will cross our southern border today. Some of them will be criminals, some gang members. I pray none are terrorists. But the truth is, we don't know. A nation without borders ceases to be a nation, which is why we must secure our border first.

IMMIGRATION REFORM

(Ms. SOLIS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. SOLIS. Buenos dias to our audience.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to ask my colleagues in this body to stop blocking comprehensive immigration reform. Immigrants are our neighbors, our friends, our caretakers and fellow worshippers. They contribute more than \$10 billion to our economy each year, and more than 35,000 immigrants are actively defending our Nation as members of the Armed Forces.

More than 200 Medals of Honor have been given to immigrant servicemembers for their actions in Iraq and Afghanistan. One hundred one non-U.S. citizens, like my constituent, Francisco Martinez Flores, died in military action September 11, 2001. He was a green card soldier.

Just yesterday our Nation's top general, Marine General Peter Pace, defended immigrants, saying the first Marine he lost in combat in Vietnam was an immigrant soldier. And he said that he continues to be on active duty because he says he still owes those who served with him in Vietnam, regardless of their status.

Immigrants, their families and families across the country deserve more than sham hearings and enforcement-only policies. Let's ask for a comprehensive immigration reform that takes care of all of our soldiers and all people defending our rights here in America.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KUHLMAN of New York). The Chair would remind the Members who are making 1 minute requests that, in fact, the comments are to be directed to the Speaker, to the Chair.

CHILD PORNOGRAPHY

(Mr. PITTS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, the plague of child pornography is a global program in need of a global response. A study released recently by the International Center for Missing and Exploited Children paints a sad and sobering picture.

Of the 184 countries studied, more than half have no laws addressing child pornography at all, and in most of the countries, the existing laws are inadequate.

This perverse form of exploitation horribly scars its victims, not only in the actual production of this sordid smut, but their pictures are then broadcast to the world online.

At a meeting recently of the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe, I offered a resolution on behalf of Chairman CHRIS SMITH and the U.S. delegation, calling on the nations of the world to address this growing problem.

The resolution calls on lawmaking bodies of the world to take a hard-line stance against this horrific practice and enact stiff criminal penalties for production and consumption.

I am pleased the resolution was unanimously adopted. Child pornography is a despicable business, and this resolution is a positive first step in the fight against it.

BUSH-GOP ECONOMY HAS FAILED MIDDLE CLASS FAMILIES

(Mr. PALLONE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, last week's disappointing job creation numbers once again highlight that the Bush economic recovery is a failure, is really not a recovery at all, and continues to fail America's families.

In June, the Bush economy added only 121,000 jobs. That is less than the 150,000 needed just to keep pace with population growth. President Bush still has the worst jobs record since the

Great Depression, creating, on average, only 42,000 jobs per month.

Now, in the meantime, millions of American families are living paycheck to paycheck, struggling to make ends meet and going deeper into debt. With an economic record like this, you would think Washington Republicans would be coming up with some ideas on how to improve the economy. But, instead, Republicans say the economy is great.

Now, Democrats know better. We are fighting to expand economic opportunity for all by increasing the minimum wage, eliminating tax giveaways that encourage companies to move jobs overseas, and giving tax breaks to parents and students to better afford a higher education.

The problem, Mr. Speaker, is that Republicans are content with the status quo. Democrats are proposing creative ideas.

BORDER VULNERABILITIES AND INTERNATIONAL TERRORISM

(Mr. ROYCE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, the Subcommittee on International Terrorism that I chair held two field hearings last week, one in San Diego and one in Laredo, Texas, on border vulnerabilities and international terrorism.

The unfortunate fact is that we live in a time when terrorists want to hit us as hard as they can. And it is elementary that to defend ourselves against these determined and resourceful enemies, our border must be secure or, as the Border Patrol says, "We must have operational control of the border." We don't have that right now, and we don't have that despite a tenfold increase in what Republicans have done to fund homeland security.

But we need border fencing. And in Laredo, Texas, sheriffs told us of drug cartels and smuggling rings increasingly well equipped and more brazen than ever in attacking law enforcement officials. The Border Patrol warns of potential terrorists employing these networks to enter our country. Last year, it apprehended illegal border crossers from many countries designated state sponsors of terrorism or countries where terrorist organizations are active.

The sheriffs we heard from strongly seconded the Border Patrol's concerns about terrorists crossing our porous borders.

Colleagues, immigration reform must be national security reform.

DEMOCRATS AND REPUBLICANS WORKING TOGETHER TO PROTECT AMERICA

(Mr. BILBRAY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BILBRAY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank Chairman ROYCE for holding a hearing in Imperial Beach in San Diego County this week. And I think there was one very clear mes-

sage, that amnesty is the greatest mistake that we could have, not only for immigration, but for common sense, and if not for common decency, that we should not reward those who have broken our immigration laws while people, millions, wait to immigrate legally.

But the one consensus we could make in that hearing was that Democrats and Republicans agree that the missing link in immigration reform is not spending more money, but having more enforcement against the source of the major cause of illegal immigration. That is illegal employment.

And so I would ask Democrats and Republicans to find these hearings as a consensus to talk about what are we doing to stop illegal employment. And I would ask both of you to take a look at SILVESTRE REYES' and DAVID DREIER's bill, H.R. 98, which says that we are going to crack down on illegal employers. But we are going to create a very simple way for employers to know who is legal and who is illegal, and that is to have a Social Security card that is as tamper resistant as our voting card.

So let's get together. If SILVESTRE REYES and DAVID DREIER can work together, can't the House, both Democrats and Republicans, work together to protect America?

IRAQ

(Mr. GINGREY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the important progress being made in Iraq. Let me remind my colleagues and the American people of the incredible accomplishments United States troops and the Iraqi people have achieved over the last 4 years.

Saddam Hussein is behind bars, and al Qaeda's top leaders have been eliminated. Iraqi security forces currently participate in more than 90 percent of all security operations, and the Iraqi people are increasingly coming forth with actionable intelligence about terrorist activity.

But, Mr. Speaker, the progress in Iraq cannot be measured solely on our military success. The Iraqi people can now watch commercial television. They can read independent newspapers. Women are part of the political process. In fact, women secured 31 percent of the seats in the Iraqi National Assembly. Primary school enrollment has increased by nearly 3 million children, and Iraqi medical schools now graduate more than 2,000 doctors a year.

So, Mr. Speaker, as we congratulate the Iraqi people on these successes, let's not forget to thank our troops for the important work they are doing in Iraq, training soldiers, building schools, working every day for security and freedom in the Middle East.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4411, INTERNET GAMBLING PROHIBITION AND ENFORCEMENT ACT

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 907 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

H. RES. 907

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order without intervention of any point of order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 4411) to prevent the use of certain payment instruments, credit cards, and fund transfers for unlawful Internet gambling, and for other purposes. In lieu of the amendments recommended by the Committees on Financial Services and the Judiciary now printed in the bill, the amendment in the nature of a substitute depicted in the Rules Committee Print dated July 5, 2006, shall be considered as adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and on any further amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate on the bill, as amended, equally divided among and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Financial Services and the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary; (2) the further amendment printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution, if offered by Representative Berkley of Nevada or her designee, which shall be in order without intervention of any point of order or demand for division of the question, shall be considered as read, and shall be separately debatable for 20 minutes equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent; and (3) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Georgia (Mr. GINGREY) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

Mr. Speaker, this House resolution is a structured rule, House Resolution 907, and it provides 1 hour of debate in the House, equally divided among and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Financial Services and the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary.

□ 1045

This resolution waives all points of order against consideration of the bill. It provides that in lieu of the amendments recommended by the Committees on Financial Services and the Judiciary now printed in the bill, the amendment in the nature of a substitute, depicted in the Rules Committee Print dated July 5, 2006, shall be considered as adopted. This resolution makes in order the amendment printed in the Rules Committee report accompanying the resolution, if offered by

Representative BERKLEY of Nevada or her designee, which shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for 20 minutes equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question. This resolution waives all points of order against the amendment printed in the Rules Committee report, and it provides one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of House Resolution 907 and the underlying bill, H.R. 4411, the Unlawful Internet Gambling Enforcement Act.

First, I want to recognize and thank Chairman SENSENBRENNER and Chairman OXLEY for shepherding this bill through their committees to the floor for consideration. And, additionally, I would like to also recognize Representatives LEACH and GOODLATTE, the co-authors of H.R. 4411, for all of their hard work to ensure that laws are updated to the year 2006 and that we crack down on those who would circumvent existing law.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 4411 would amend existing statutes to prohibit individuals and companies in the gambling industry from knowingly accepting credit card, check, electronic fund transfers, and other similar means or the proceeds of any other financial transaction in connection with unlawful Internet gambling. Further, this bill would direct the Secretary of the Treasury and the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System to develop and prescribe regulations which are necessary and proper to identify and prevent the previously mentioned types of transactions.

Essentially, Mr. Speaker, this bill aims to modernize existing law as established by the Wire Act of 1961 to both address the changing technological landscape and clarify the currently vague statutory definition of "bets and wagers." This clarification is needed in order to close the "black-jack" loophole that allows games like poker, blackjack, and roulette to slip through the cracks of existing law. Additionally, this bill would increase from 2 years to 5 years the penalty for violating the Wire Act as well as this underlying bill. This bill also reaffirms our commitment to federalism by protecting the rights of the States to regulate Internet gambling within their respective borders.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 4411 is a good bill that makes sure the letter of the law catches up with the spirit of the law, given the emergence of new technologies and the proliferation of underground and overseas gambling organizations that attempt to skirt the rule of law and exploit individuals.

So as we move forward with this debate, I want to encourage my colleagues to support the rule and support this underlying bill.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Georgia

(Mr. GINGREY) for yielding me the customary 30 minutes, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I am going to do something different today. I am going to commend the majority for this rule. Internet gambling is an issue that does not break along traditional partisan lines. There are Democrats and Republicans who support the underlying bill before us, and there are Democrats and Republicans who oppose it. This rule makes in order legislation that regulates Internet gambling, but it also makes in order an important amendment offered by Representatives BERKLEY, WEXLER, and CONYERS, Members who do not support the bill as it is currently written.

This is a fair rule because it accommodates all the views expressed last night in the Rules Committee. This is how the legislative process should work, and I hope the Republican leadership will report more rules like this.

Having said that, Mr. Speaker, I do feel compelled to point out that the Republican leadership has scheduled the last vote today for some time around 2 or 3 o'clock. Tomorrow and Thursday are both expected to be short voting days, and we are not scheduled to be in session on Friday. There is plenty of time for the House to consider other important legislation, for example, an increase in the minimum wage that is long overdue and is supported by, I think, virtually all Democrats and even some Republicans. So, Mr. Speaker, where is the minimum wage?

To my friends on the other side of the aisle, why won't you allow this House to vote to increase the minimum wage?

Yesterday's Washington Post featured a front page article detailing the wage disparity in the metropolitan D.C. area. High-skilled workers are making increasingly higher salaries, but lower-skilled workers are being left behind. We know this is true for workers all across this country. The minimum wage is not keeping pace with the cost of living in America today. Housing costs are up, energy costs are through the roof, low-wage workers need help; and Congress cannot and should not continue to ignore the plight of low-income workers in America. Families are living paycheck to paycheck. They are struggling to make ends meet as the minimum wage is at its lowest level in 50 years, as I said, with rising health care costs, energy, and college costs that they have to deal with.

Poverty is getting worse in our country today. That is a fact. And it is frustrating that the leadership on the other side of the aisle seems indifferent to that sad reality. They pass tax cut after tax cut after tax cut after tax cut for millionaires, and yet they cannot find the time for us to consider an increase in the minimum wage.

This leadership has allowed for regular increases in congressional salary.

Now, I know Members of Congress work hard. I am not saying that people here do not deserve a good salary. But surely my friends on the other side of the aisle must recognize that low-wage workers work hard too. They have families to support too. They have bills to pay too.

Mr. Speaker, we have the opportunity to change this. The Republican leadership certainly cannot claim that we do not have the time to consider an increase in the minimum wage. And I am willing to stay in session after 3 p.m. today to vote on this. I am willing to stay here on Friday. I am willing to give up the August recess until we vote to increase the minimum wage.

Mr. Speaker, it is not a question of timing. We know there is enough time to consider a minimum wage increase. It is a question of priorities. And the priorities of this Congress always seem to ignore those who are struggling most. Mr. Speaker, the American people deserve better than this.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Speaker, at this time I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished chairman of the Agriculture Committee, the gentleman from Virginia and coauthor of this bill, Mr. GOODLATTE.

(Mr. GOODLATTE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. GINGREY) for his generously yielding me this time.

I rise in strong support of this rule reported out of the Rules Committee and of the underlying legislation, which I have been pleased to introduce along with the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. LEACH), the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BOUCHER), and more than 150 other Members of the House to address something that is long overdue, and that is modernization of our laws, our Federal laws, dealing with gambling, particularly what is referred to as Internet gambling.

This is a scourge on our society. It causes innumerable problems. Historically, gambling in the United States has been illegal unless regulated by the States. But Internet gambling ignores the laws of the 50 States, which vary each one compared to the next. Some States, like Utah, ban all forms of gambling. Other States, like Nevada next door, legalize a great many forms of gambling. This legislation does not interfere with that, but it addresses the now hundreds and hundreds and hundreds of offshore sites that are sucking billions of dollars. The latest estimate is a \$12 billion industry with more than half of that coming out of the United States illegally, unregulated, untaxed.

Many like me who are opposed to gambling are concerned about the family problems. I have one family in my district whose son committed suicide because of debts run up on the Internet

due to gambling. Many are aware recently of the student at Lehigh University who ran up significant gambling debts and then robbed a bank in order to try to pay those off.

Those anecdotal evidences simply help to point out what is a magnifying problem of family problems, bankruptcy problems, problems with minors gambling, problems with addiction to gambling, problems with organized crime's being involved in gambling, all of which goes completely out of the purview of the States, which have jurisdiction over gambling in the United States.

So as a result of that, 48 out of 50 of our State attorneys general and the U.S. Justice Department and many other organizations, all the major sports organizations of the United States, many family organizations, many religious organizations, have come to the Congress asking for this legislation, asking to modernize the Wire Act, asking to take steps, as Congressman LEACH has ably done in his legislation coming out of the Financial Services Committee, to enable the Treasury Department, working with law enforcement, working with the financial industry in this country, to see that this flow of money going out to these sites is cut off.

This legislation accomplishes those goals. It is supported by the National Collegiate Athletic Organization that is concerned about the proliferation of sports betting on the Internet and the effect that it is having on their ability to keep these games fair and honest. We have had scandals in the past with regard to betting on sports. And all of the major sports organizations in the country, the National Football League, Major League Baseball, the National Hockey League, the National Basketball Association, have joined with the NCAA in supporting this legislation. But other groups, the Family Research Council, Focus on the Family, Advance USA, Eagle Forum, the United Methodists, Southern Baptists, and many, many other religious organizations and family organizations have joined in support of this effort to address this problem. And it is my hope that the House today will pass this legislation.

In the process it is very, very important that the amendment that has been made in order under the rule be defeated because this is, most clearly, a poison pill amendment. This amendment is designed to take away the carefully crafted legislation, the careful negotiations with the States to make it clear that the Congress is not attempting to interfere with the activities of the States that take place completely confined within their borders. This addresses interstate gambling on the Internet, and it addresses offshore gambling on the Internet. And this amendment would take out of the legislation those carefully crafted provisions and would effectively gut the bill and defeat the cooperative effort that the Congress has been engaged in with

the States, with the State attorneys general, with the Justice Department, and with others. So I would urge my colleagues to support the legislation and to defeat the amendment.

The legislation clarifies the Wire Act, the 1961 statute that made it a Federal felony for gambling businesses to use wire communication facilities to transmit bets or wagers or related money in interstate or foreign commerce. The Wire Act did not contemplate the Internet or wireless communications devices and is ambiguous as to whether it applies to only sports-related gambling or all forms of gambling. The bill updates the Wire Act to clarify that it covers all types of gambling and all types of communication facilities.

H.R. 4411 also increases the maximum penalty for violations of the Wire Act from 2 to 5 years in prison and explicitly preserves the right of the States to regulate gambling that occurs solely within State borders. And the bill cuts off the flow of money to Internet gambling Web sites by regulating payment systems. The Department of the Treasury and the Federal Reserve will jointly develop policies and procedures for identifying and preventing financial transactions related to illegal Internet gambling.

□ 1100

Payment systems will be required to comply with these regulations. Even when criminal law cannot be enforced, the Federal Government's jurisdiction over financial systems can nevertheless cut off the money sources for these illegal businesses.

The bill authorizes State and Federal law enforcement to seek injunctions against persons who facilitate illegal Internet gambling, even when the person is not criminally liable; and when deliberating with foreign governments, the U.S. Government is exhorted to advance international cooperation in law enforcement efforts against illegal gambling and related money laundering. The Secretary of the Treasury will report to Congress about these efforts.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there is another aspect of this legislation that many people are very familiar with, and that is that 6 years ago the predecessor to this legislation was killed on the floor of this House, and subsequently in another Congress in the Judiciary Committee, based upon the misleading representations and the flow of enormous sums of money related to lobbying activities of one Jack Abramoff, who has been widely reported in coverage in the Washington Post and elsewhere regarding the activities that he and others carrying his water, his dirty laundry, engaged in to misrepresent the purposes of this legislation and to defeat it.

Many in this House are very determined that they have the opportunity today to clear the record, to purge the smear on the Congress that was placed

on it by these actions; and Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to take full advantage of that opportunity to do today what should have been done back then when this industry was much smaller. It has quadrupled in size since then, and we need to make sure that this legislation passes this House here today.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the legislation, defeat the amendment and support the rule.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, as I said before, we don't have any problem with the rule that is before us today. We have a problem with the priorities of the Republican leadership in this House.

As I look at the schedule today, as I said before, we are out at 2 o'clock today. We are dealing with the bill that we are talking about right now and then some suspensions that really aren't terribly significant. I am willing to stay till 5 or 6 if we could debate the minimum wage.

Let's give the American workers an increase in their salaries. The average CEO in the United States earns 821 times more than the minimum wage worker, earning more before lunchtime than a minimum wage worker earns all year.

I think it is wrong to have millions of Americans working full time and year round and still living in poverty. I would like to think if you work in this country you can get out of poverty. I think it is wrong to give Congress a raise when millions of workers have not had a penny raise in 9 years.

Over 9 years, this House has given themselves something like \$35,000 in pay increases, and we have not even addressed the issue of the minimum wage, and millions of our fellow citizens are locked into this minimum wage. It is wrong to give tax cut after tax cut after tax cut after tax cut to millionaires and to special interests when you do nothing for minimum-wage workers.

Nearly 15 million Americans will benefit from a minimum wage increase to \$7.25 an hour, 6.6 million directly and 8.3 million indirectly. Almost 60 percent of these workers are women. Forty percent are people of color. Raising the minimum wage to \$7.25 an hour equals an additional \$4,400 a year for a family of three. That is 15 months of groceries, over 2 years of health care, 2 years of college tuition at a public 2-year college. I could go on and on and on.

It is astounding to me that we find ourselves back after the July 4 recess and we are told we will get to these important issues like the minimum wage when we can get to them. We have nothing going on this week that will keep us here beyond Thursday or keep us here until 5 o'clock today or even tomorrow.

What we are asking for is the opportunity to be able to debate the issue of increasing the Federal minimum wage and letting people in this Chamber,

both Republicans and Democrats, have an opportunity to vote up or down.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER), a champion on this issue.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts, and I just want to join him in his remarks that this really is not about this rule, but this is the only place where we can protest the priorities of this Congress when there are millions of American workers who work at the minimum wage, who are unable to provide for their families the basic necessities of their families. And Congress fails to address that issue and fails to address it especially when it is so clear the voids in the congressional schedule, where there are these huge gaps of time where it would be available to debate the minimum wage, hold hearings on the minimum wage, and report out a bill for consideration by the Members of Congress. And yet that is not being done.

It is not being done basically because the Republican leadership has committed itself to its supporters and the business community that it will not allow a minimum wage vote to come before the House of Representatives, even though it is clear that there is probably enough support to pass this legislation to increase the minimum wage to \$7.25 an hour over the next couple of years.

By doing that, we dramatically change the lives of those individuals who today work at \$5.15 an hour. We dramatically change the lives of the 1.6 million workers who are parents of children under the age of 18 who earn the minimum wage. All together those parents are working to raise more than 3 million children, and yet with the minimum wage stuck at \$5.15 an hour, they are unable to provide the necessities for their family, for those children.

Mind you, these families are stuck at a wage of 1997. The Members of this House cannot think of anything else that is stuck at 1997. The price of bread is not struck in 1997 prices. The price of gasoline is not at 1997 prices. The price of health care is not at 1997 prices. But for these people who work every day and work at very difficult jobs, jobs most other people might not take, certainly will not take at this wage, they end up at the end of the year poor.

At the end of this congressional year, this Congress will not be able to find the time to address this urgent economic need.

We have supporters for increasing the minimum wage, a company I don't generally agree with, but Wal-Mart, who says essentially, even at their stores where they advertise everyday low prices, that the people who shop in the stores at minimum wage are not making enough money to buy the basic necessities that are offered. There is not enough money in the communities to provide for the success of those stores.

This is about whether or not we are going to create an underclass in America, an underclass probably we already have because these people are stuck in 1997 wages. But now that you know it, what is the morality of ignoring them? What is the morality of making a conscious decision that you are going to go out of session today at 2 o'clock as opposed to staying a couple of hours longer and dealing with the minimum wage? What is the morality that you are going to end this session of Congress where I think we have maybe 30 days left before adjournment without addressing the minimum wage?

What is it you are saying to these people about the worth that they are worth, about their lives, about their desire to take care of their children, to provide the necessities, to provide the wherewithal for the education and the health and the nutrition of their children?

Try doing it on \$5.15 an hour. It won't buy you 2 gallons of gas today, so I hope you don't have to commute very far. It certainly won't help with health care payments because you have to pay the rent, and today we see rent is going up as housing markets go up.

So we leave these people stranded. And you want to talk about values, you want to talk about families, you want to talk about children, you want to talk about community, and you are creating an underclass that is so desperate, and yet these people make the decision to go to work every day. Explain the morality of that.

No, you are going to spend your morality on Internet gaming. We are going to say to people, if you bet on a horse, you are legal; if you bet on a dog, you are not. If you bet in one State, you are legal; not if in another. If you want to play Texas Hold 'Em, you are legal in some States, but not in other States.

No, let's talk about the morality of a family that is struggling every day to hold itself together at a time of increasing utility costs, increasing food costs, increasing transportation costs, increasing energy costs; and this Congress, under Republican leadership, simply will not make time to discuss this issue, to vote on this issue. We are not finding the time under this leadership to vote on this issue.

That is why we are going to ask for a vote on the previous question to suggest to you that there is another way to run this Congress, to run it for the benefit of these desperate Americans who are working hard every day, but not getting compensated in today's pay.

Imagine. You didn't think it was sufficient that you all get compensated here at 1997 wages, so we have continued to provide a COLA. I think it is justified, but the fact of the matter is, for millions of Americans, you have made a conscious decision while we get a COLA, we are going to trap them in 1997 wages.

I thank the gentleman, I thank him for his leadership, for allowing his co-

operation on allowing this opportunity to have this vote and again to try to express to this Congress, because now we are lobbying the Congress on behalf of the people that are not politically engaged, are not politically active. They are working too hard; they are working too hard at work, and they are working too hard the rest of the day trying to figure out how they hold their families together.

And what do they get from the Republican Congress? They get the back of their hand. They get the back of their hand. These people's workday does not end at 5 o'clock. They spend the rest of the time trying to figure out how they are going to juggle transportation costs, food costs, health care, education, how they are going to do that for those 3 million children. And we sit by and we end the workday at 2 o'clock? At 2 o'clock, they are just getting started. We end the work day at 5 o'clock; they are driving home and figuring out whether or not they can go by the supermarket. Or we are not going to work on Fridays. They go to work on Fridays. They go to work all day on Fridays. We are going to work at 6 o'clock on Monday night. They went to work at 6 o'clock Monday morning.

Do you start to get the sense of the inequities that are taking place here that are within your power to change?

Let me tell you, you say, oh, you are going to kill jobs. There is no evidence that that is the case. In fact, those States that have increased the minimum wage apparently are doing a little better economically and having more job creation than those States that did not. But let me tell you, if you have a business plan that is dependent upon paying people 1997 wages, there may be something wrong with your business plan.

I do not think we should become co-conspirators in creating this underclass, and we should not be able to look the other way as we live a life that is completely out of touch with the struggle of these people, with our neighbors, with people living in our community. They struggle on the job and off the job because it never ends for them trying to make ends meet. And we stroll in here on a Tuesday morning, we stroll out of here on a Thursday night. We stroll out of here for the month of August and we stroll out of here in November and we can't find time? We can't find time to address this issue?

We are not asking you to raise the wages from today. We are asking you to raise the wages from 1997.

I thank the gentleman for yielding the time.

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds.

It is interesting to hear from the other side the complaint about ending our workday at 2 o'clock or 3 o'clock or 4 o'clock in the afternoon, whatever the case may be, and yet we hear from them repeatedly of the accusation that

the Republicans are passing bills in the dark of the night. So no matter how we do it, they are going to criticize us.

I think the schedule that we keep is the one that gets things done and gets it done in an effective way.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. DUNCAN).

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Georgia for giving me this time, and I rise in strong support of this bill by the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. LEACH) and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE) and the rule which brings this bill to the floor. I am pleased to be a cosponsor of this legislation, which by the way, in case there is any confusion, has nothing whatsoever to do with the minimum wage.

We just heard a few minutes ago a very detailed explanation of this legislation by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE), one of the primary sponsors to deal with this, what he described as a \$12 billion industry growing very rapidly, this problem of Internet gambling. This bill, this legislation, is a very reasonable and rational response to what is a very fast-growing national problem.

For the past 40 years or so, governments at all levels have been shrinking the tax base by taking more and more property off the tax rolls. At the same time, demands for more and more funding from all government agencies has been growing. Governments at all levels have turned to gambling in a desperate attempt to raise more revenue. Many States now promote lotteries or even allow casinos or other forms of gambling.

This sounds great, of course, for a politician to create a park, but we have now taken so much land off the tax rolls that we continuously hear about shortfalls in funding for every government activity. Half the land is now in some type of public or quasi-public ownership.

But gambling should not be the answer, Mr. Speaker. Several million people already are addicted to one form of gambling or another. This problem is going to grow, and many families will suffer if government keeps promoting gambling, and especially if it can be done by pushing a few buttons in the privacy and comfort of a home.

The Internet is addictive for many people, anyway, and online gambling can be doubly addictive. We need to put modest and reasonable limitations in place on Internet gambling, and this bill does that.

I urge its support.

□ 1115

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the bill before us today supposedly is part of the Republican Family Values Agenda. But going back to what my colleague from California (Mr. MILLER) asked, shouldn't any family value agenda include guaranteeing

working families a livable, decent wage?

The fact of the matter is, if the minimum wage had increased at the same rate as the salary increase CEOs had received, it would now be \$23.03 an hour. Members of Congress, as I have reminded my colleagues, have awarded themselves eight pay raises since they last raised the minimum wage. Thirty-five percent of workers who received a minimum wage are their family's sole earners. Sixty-one percent are women. And almost one-third of these women are raising children.

Oftentimes we hear the other side say that this will somehow hurt small business. Well, the fact of the matter is, small businesses perform better in States with higher minimum wages. Between 1998 and 2004, the job growth for small businesses in States with a minimum wage higher than the Federal level was 6.2 percent compared to a 4.1 percent growth in States where the Federal level prevailed.

The bottom line is, those of us on this side believe that increasing the minimum wage for working families in this country needs to be a priority, and we would prefer to have this discussion during a debate on the minimum wage. Unfortunately, the leadership on the other side continues to deny us that opportunity. So again I would urge my colleagues on the other side of the aisle who agree with us to press your leadership to allow us to have a vote on the minimum wage. We could do it today.

Again, I would remind my friend from Georgia (Mr. GINGREY) that according to the schedule that we are out by 2 today. We have plenty of time to do it today. We could do it tomorrow. We could do it Friday. We have the whole day on Friday we could do it. So again I would urge my colleagues to support any effort to increase the Federal minimum wage.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. OSBORNE), and I trust that he will be speaking about H.R. 4411 and this rule concerning the Unlawful Internet Gambling Enforcement Act of 2006.

Mr. OSBORNE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank Mr. GINGREY for yielding me time. I also thank Chairman OXLEY and Representative GOODLATTE for their work on this bill, and Representative LEACH and many others.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to emphasize that this is a tremendously important piece of legislation. This is not a filler. This is not something we are just going through the motions on. The reason I say this is that gambling causes poverty. It causes poverty, in many cases, as much as the wage actually paid an individual. It causes family dysfunction. It causes crime, embezzlement, theft.

There is nothing that we can do right now at this particular time that I think is more germane to the welfare

of families and people in the United States than this legislation. The proliferation of Internet gambling is fueling the growth of illegal sports gambling on college campuses across the country. That is why this legislation is endorsed by the NCAA, the NFL and Major League Baseball. The reason I am coming at it from this perspective is, as a coach for 36 years, I was always very concerned about the impact of gambling on athletics.

A 2003 study by the NCAA showed that almost 35 percent of male student athletes engaged in some type of sports wagering behavior in the previous year, and roughly 10 percent of female student athletes did as well. For instance, one athlete reported a \$10,000 Internet gambling debt.

Now, when you have that type of debt, and you are a student, there is almost no way you can pay it off except you can possibly say, well, you know, if I cooperate with the gamblers, and if I miss a free throw or fumble the football or fix a game, then I can be made whole.

And so the integrity of athletics is pretty much at jeopardy in this regard, and particularly because Internet gambling can be done in such an inconspicuous way. Almost every college student has access to a computer, and 70 percent of them have credit cards. Therefore, this is a huge problem on the college campus.

College students are more likely to fall victim to serious gambling problems. According to a 1997 study by Harvard University, college students show the highest percentage of pathological and problem gambling of any subgroup in the country.

So because of the pervasive, legal, economic and social challenges posed by the rapid growth of Internet gambling, the National Gambling Impact Study Commission unanimously recommended, in its 1999 final report, that the Federal Government prohibit all Internet gambling not authorized and legalized by law.

H.R. 4411, the Unlawful Internet Gambling Enforcement Act, provides new law enforcement mechanisms to stop offshore casinos that are violating existing State and Federal laws against Internet gambling. The ease of Internet gambling poses a very serious threat to our families and our society.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to be a cosponsor of this legislation. I urge support by my colleagues. Support the rule and underlying legislation to crack down on illegal Internet gambling.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS).

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Ladies and gentlemen of the House, H.R. 4411 can also be considered Abramoff's revenge. Because as the Cato Institute itself, not the most liberal think tank around, has suggested, we are doing exactly what he wanted us to do.

What he wanted us to do is to push this bill as the anti-Abramoff bill, which is quite disingenuous. The Abramoff stuff is just latching on to the backlash to try to push it through.

And so for all of you who thought that we were doing something that he might not approve of, I just want you to know that this measure offers the gambling bill as something that he would now support in its present form. It is a very critical point to consider. It is a bill that he would have supported in 2000. And though the bill is being rationalized as a way to exorcise the demons of 2000, the reality is the bill serves the client, his clients or ex-clients' interests indeed.

I am hopeful that the Members, particularly my friend from Iowa, will recognize that what they are trying to do and that we know about his past involvement in the killing of the 2000 bill is now just the reverse.

JULY 11, 2006.

DEAR COLLEAGUE: "Lobbyist Jack Abramoff and his team were beginning to panic.

"An anti-gambling bill had cleared the Senate and appeared on its way to passage by an overwhelming margin in the House of Representatives. If that happened, Abramoff's client, a company that wanted to sell state lottery tickets online, would be out of business." ("How a Lobbyist Stacked the Deck: Abramoff Used DeLay Aide, Attacks On Allies to Defeat Anti-Gambling Bill," Susan Schmidt and James V. Grimaldi, Washington Post, October 16, 2005)

If he were still lobbying and not on his way to jail, Abramoff and his former client would have no reason to panic about H.R. 4411, the revised Internet gambling bill scheduled for a vote on Wednesday. That's because H.R. 4411 contains precisely the loophole for state lotteries that Abramoff was hired to secure in 2000.

The bill's supporters often invokes the defeat of his bill in 2000 and lobbyist Jack Abramoff's role in that defeat as a reason to enact this year's bill. However, supporters conspicuously fails to note that Abramoff's goal was to preserve the ability of his then-client, ELottery.com, to bring state lotteries onto the Internet. He only worked to defeat the Goodlatte bill when it was clear that state lotteries would not be exempt from the ban.

He would be able to rest easy today. That's because H.R. 4411 contains an amendment to the Federal Wire Act that would allow states (and companies working with those states) to sell lottery tickets online so long as certain minimal conditions are met, e.g. the State must specifically authorize online lottery ticket sales. Given that some states already are looking to sell tickets online in order to boost revenues, the new version of the bill will give those states a green light.

H.R. 4411 is Abramoff's revenge. It is a bill that he could have supported in 2000. And though passage of this bill is rationalized as a way to exorcise the demons of 2000, the reality is this bill serves his client's interests..

Sincerely,

JOHN CONYERS, JR.,
Ranking Member.

GOP OFFERS GAMBLING BILL AS ABRAMOFF
ELIXIR

(By Kathryn A. Wolfe)

Some Republicans are touting Internet gambling legislation the House likely will

pass Tuesday as evidence that disgraced lobbyist Jack Abramoff's influence is gone—even though the measure would protect many of the gambling interests he once represented.

Abramoff's lobbying activities, including actions he took on behalf of the Connecticut-based gambling company eLottery, are under Justice Department investigation. He separately pleaded guilty Jan. 4 to conspiracy and fraud charges stemming from the 2000 purchase of a gambling boat fleet and was sentenced to five years and 10 months in prison.

eLottery, which helps state and international governments and Indian tribes market lottery tickets online, hired Abramoff to lobby against a 2000 bill that sought to establish criminal penalties for Web sites offering Internet gambling, including those selling tickets for state lotteries online. He sought to kill the bill entirely, or alternatively to carve exceptions for certain powerful gambling industries. The measure was defeated on the House floor July 17, 2000.

This year, lawmakers, eager to turn the Abramoff scandal into something positive, have begun a new push to enact slightly different legislation intended to curb Internet gambling. Much of the rhetoric swirling around the bills portrays them as the mop with which lawmakers will cleanse the Capitol of Abramoff's influence.

During a House Financial Services Committee markup on March 14, Jim Leach, R-Iowa, a sponsor of one measure to curb Internet gambling (H.R. 4411), hinted at Abramoff's past involvement in killing the 2000 bill, suggesting the affair is a stain on Congress.

"Congress is in certain disrepute," Leach said. "[The bill] is part and parcel of what I consider to be necessary to clean up the Congress."

Leach's bill would prohibit banks and credit card companies from processing payments for online gambling bets.

Republican leaders decided to fold another Internet gambling bill (H.R. 4777) by Robert W. Goodlatte, R-Va., into Leach's bill for floor action Tuesday.

Goodlatte's bill—approved 25–11 by the Judiciary Committee on May 25—would prohibit gambling businesses from accepting credit cards and electronic transfers for online betting. It also would modify the 1961 Wire Act (PL 87–216) to clarify that its prohibitions apply to Internet gambling, not just sports bets placed over telephone wires.

It appears likely the gambling legislation will win sizable Democratic support on the floor. Goodlatte's bill was supported by four Democrats on the Judiciary panel. The Financial Services Committee approved Leach's bill by voice vote.

However, some congressional aides and policy analysts who have followed the legislation say little has changed since Abramoff succumbed to scandal.

"If they pass this bill, it will be clear that Abramoff has won and everything he fought for is still protected—all the industries, carve-outs and exceptions," said a Democratic aide familiar with the bills.

Indeed, neither Goodlatte's nor Leach's bill would apply its prohibitions to interstate online wagering on horse races. And Goodlatte's bill contains an exemption for online state lotteries.

Both measures also contain exemptions for fantasy sports leagues that offer cash prizes at the behest of Major League Baseball and grass-roots fan organizations such as the Fantasy Sports Association.

Goodlatte's bill expressly states that it would not prohibit activities allowed under

the Interstate Horseracing Act (PL 95–515), the 1978 law that allows off-track betting facilities to accept interstate horse bets. The horse wagering industry and the Justice Department are locked in a battle over whether that law allows online interstate horse betting.

GOP leaders decided to allow one floor amendment to be offered to the bill, which would eliminate all waivers or exceptions for certain types of Internet gambling.

Goodlatte bristles at suggestions that his bill contains "carve-outs" for the horse-racing industry, arguing that it does not get involved in the issue. "I have very carefully stayed away from that debate," Goodlatte said. "This legislation is not the place to get into this issue."

But Radley Balko, a policy analyst for the Cato Institute, a libertarian think tank, says that by remaining silent on the debate, the measures in effect contain an exemption.

Balko said the horse-racing industry will likely attempt to use the bills to bolster its case in its spat with the Justice Department by arguing that lawmakers' silence on the issue is tacit approval from Congress.

"This is exactly the bill Jack Abramoff would've wanted," Balko said. "So to push it as the anti-Abramoff bill is disingenuous. The Abramoff stuff is just latching on . . . to the backlash to try to push this through."

Goodlatte has been particularly vocal about the online wagering issue's connection with Abramoff. During a February appearance on CNBC, Goodlatte noted that he introduced his bill with 116 cosponsors, saying many who voted against the 2000 bill "were misled by Mr. Abramoff and others about the function of the legislation [and] are now saying 'We want on board.'"

Those who voted against the 2000 measure who this year are cosponsoring Goodlatte's bill include House Majority Whip Roy Blunt, R-Mo.; Dave Camp, R-Mich.; Steve Chabot, R-Ohio; Gene Green, D-Texas; Bill Jenkins, R-Tenn.; Thomas M. Davis III, R-Va.; Jack Kingston, R-Ga.; and Fred Upton, R-Mich. Tom DeLay, R-Texas, also signed on as a cosponsor, although he has since resigned from Congress.

The lawmakers who answered requests for comment on the matter—Blunt, Camp and Green—brushed aside suggestions they were influenced on the 2000 bill by Abramoff's efforts, saying this year's bills simply take a better approach. The rest did not return calls seeking comment.

"Congressman Blunt had concerns regarding potential loopholes in the bill when the House last voted," said spokeswoman Jessica Boulanger. "His major concerns have been addressed and it is clear that the benefits of getting this bill done expeditiously outweigh any other concerns."

Supporters of cracking down on Internet gambling, including the conservative Christian group the Traditional Values Coalition, view online gambling as a conduit for money laundering and a breeding ground for a host of social ills.

Opponents of the bills include professional and recreational gamblers, the online gambling industry, libertarian groups and some financial institutions, especially small banks, which fear it will be impossible to comply with the bills' directives.

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4½ minutes to the coauthor of this important piece of legislation, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. LEACH).

Mr. LEACH. Mr. Speaker, I hadn't intended to speak during the rule. I

would comment to begin with on Mr. MCGOVERN's point. I think he has a really quite excellent one on the minimum wage. But I must frankly differ quite profoundly with the comments of my good friend, the distinguished ranking member of the Judiciary Committee from Michigan.

The public record is very clear, JOHN, and there is no equivocation, no conceivable other interpretation. A bill was brought to the floor in the year 2000, which was brought by BOB GOODLATTE, and a great deal of lobbying went into it to defeat it by Mr. Abramoff. It did not get the requisite two-thirds vote.

Subsequently, in addition, the record is quite clear, on three separate occasions, the House banking committee brought a bill out that was not allowed to come to the floor. And there is every indication that it was a group led by Mr. Abramoff and others that blocked the leadership from allowing the bill to come to the floor.

And so I do not want anyone to think and be sidetracked into any other interpretation. This is an interpretation, by the way, fully shared by all of the outside groups looking at the issue. I know of no group that has a different interpretation than this.

Now, I recognize the gentleman has a long-held view about the appropriateness, and it is a credible approach of legalizing gambling. It is not an approach that I share, but it is credible. And this bill goes in the other direction.

As we go down this path, it is important that we all reflect the issues that we believe in from one perspective or another, but I don't think we should misinterpret history. And I know Mr. GOODLATTE from your committee has personal scars on what happened from influence peddlers from the outside world that have come and blocked approaches that he has advocated for long periods of time, and I have advocated also for a fair length of time.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEACH. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I want to ask the question, Does this not contain carve-outs for horse racing?

Mr. LEACH. Actually, let me respond to that.

Mr. CONYERS. And lottery?

Mr. LEACH. Let me respond directly to that. The horse racing provisions in this bill reflect the Interstate Horse Racing Act. To the degree that there is any change, it is a slight upgrading restriction in horse racing, because the new definitional structures put in this bill apply to the Wire Act. This bill does not touch the dispute between the Justice Department and the horse racing community. But it increases the strength of the Justice Department's position in the sense that these new definitional structures that will apply to the Wire Act will also apply to horse racing itself.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEACH. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I thank very much the gentleman for yielding. I want to be very, very clear about this. This legislation is very, very similar to the legislation that Jack Abramoff helped to defeat. He in no way supports it, number one. Number two, there is no carve-out in this legislation for horse racing or for lotteries.

That has been misrepresented time and time again. That is exactly the device, that is exactly the argument that Jack Abramoff used to defeat this legislation twice before. So to make the argument again I think is entirely wrong; it is entirely misleading. The fact of the matter is that the horse racing industry has a separate statute, the Interstate Horse Racing Act, and this legislation does nothing to enhance that legislation nor to repeal it.

The Justice Department negotiated very carefully the language that preserves their right to proceed against the horse racing industry if they choose to do so, because they maintain that separate statute, the Interstate Horse Racing Act, does not allow them to do what they are doing.

But this legislation does nothing to enable that in any way, shape or form; nor does it do anything to enable State lotteries to engage in Internet gambling operations.

The legislation makes it very clear that for any type of operation to take place, it must be confined within the borders of the State which cannot be done on the Internet.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS).

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I am deeply impressed by the passion that my comments have raised. But remember that the old bill that he killed did not contain a lottery exemption that Abramoff wanted, and this one does. CQ may have gotten it wrong, ladies and gentlemen, I doubt it. Republicans are touting Internet gambling legislation the House will likely pass as evidence that disgraced lobbyist Jack Abramoff's influence is gone, even though the measure would protect many of the gambling interests he once represented.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Nevada (Ms. BERKLEY).

Ms. BERKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, hypocrisy is certainly rampant here in the House today. Mr. GOODLATTE, the gentleman from Virginia, apparently wants it both ways. He wants to tell us that the Department of Justice is opposed to horse race gambling, but on the other hand the horse race industry is happy as a clam.

Let me quote for you what they have said in their March 15, 2006, press re-

lease. It said they had secured language in the Leach bill to protect Internet and account wagering on horse racing. Also, NTRA worked with Congressman GOODLATTE to ensure that H.R. 4411 also contained language that protects online and account parimutuel wagering.

□ 1130

Obviously, nobody has told the horse racing industry that they are not exempt from this legislation.

After the Judiciary Committee approved the Goodlatte bill in May, the *Thoroughbred Times* printed an article titled "Gambling Bill Passes Committee With Racing Exemption Intact," which includes the sentence, "The bill includes an exemption that would allow the United States horse racing industry to continue to conduct interstate account and Internet wagering."

Now, I was raised in Las Vegas, Mr. Speaker, where gambling is legal. My children were born in Las Vegas; my parents live in Las Vegas. We are now three generations there. I take great exception to those colleagues of mine that malign the gaming industry and, thereby, the State of Nevada.

Now, I know firsthand, coming from a family whose father was a waiter, and on a waiter's salary in Las Vegas because of a strong gaming economy made enough money to put food on the table, clothes on our back, a roof over our head, and two daughters through college and law school. That is not so bad on a waiter's salary, and it doesn't happen too many other places but the State of Nevada because of our strong gaming economy. I can assure you that neither my sister nor I nor any of our friends nor any of our children have had any bad consequences because of the gaming industry.

So when I hear the gentleman from Virginia speak of a carefully crafted compromise, which this bill supposedly is, I think what he means is that he made a deal with the horse racing lobby to exempt them from this bill. And why is that? Because he knew they would fight it tooth and nail unless he gave them an exemption. And his comments to the contrary doesn't make it so.

And when the gentleman from Nebraska stands up and speaks about protecting college students, I have been down this road with him before. When it comes to gambling online, there is nothing, nothing, let me repeat that as loudly as possible for everyone to hear, there is nothing in this legislation that is going to protect college kids on campus from gambling online. We are talking about off-shore gambling sites, Internet sites that are outside of the reach of our judicial system and our regulators.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRIES

Mr. GINGREY. Parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MURPHY). The gentleman will state his inquiry.

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Speaker, is it appropriate for a Member to characterize the motivation of another Member, which I think the gentlewoman from Nevada, whether intentionally or unintentionally, just did? In addition to that, of course, reference the member as a hypocrite. And I just would like to know from the Parliamentarian, is this appropriate for a Member to characterize the motivation of another Member as Ms. BERKLEY just did regarding the distinguished author of this bill, Mr. GOODLATTE?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair reminds all Members to refrain from personalities regarding other Members' motives.

Ms. BERKLEY. May I make an inquiry?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman will state her inquiry.

Ms. BERKLEY. What would you call it when you are attempting to outlaw Internet gaming but create an exemption for horse race gambling online?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman is not stating a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT).

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, one of the problems with the discussion so far is we keep talking about prohibiting Internet gambling. There is nothing in the bill that prohibits Internet gambling. The prohibition is against running a gambling operation on the Internet in the United States. If you are running one offshore, there is no prohibition. So what we are doing is setting up a monopoly for offshore operations beyond the reach.

We are also setting up a credit card situation which cannot be enforced. How is a credit card company going to deny a bill coming in when they don't know what it is for? The credit card company has got to know it is illegal, they have got to know it was for illegal gambling rather than for something else. A lot of companies that have a lot of different entities, they may be charging for a hotel room, not for Internet gambling. And it cannot possibly be enforced. So you have a regulatory scheme that can't work and no prohibition against gambling.

If we wanted to get serious about Internet gambling, you should have put in there it is illegal to gamble. That is not in the bill. This bill is a message bill. It is unenforceable; you can't regulate it. It would make more sense since the cat is out of the bag, many countries are running Internet gambling operations already. If we are going to do anything, we ought to regulate the operations, supervise it, and tax it.

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Speaker, I would agree with the gentleman from Virginia, it would be nice if we could in the United States Congress with our laws regulate what folks can do in

Aruba or Bimini or Paradise Island. Unfortunately, we can't do that. But this bill does prohibit the use of financial instruments to pay for that gambling activity that is run offshore.

Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. If I could inquire of my friend from Georgia how many more speakers he has.

Mr. GINGREY. We currently have no more requests for speakers at this time, so I am reserving for the purpose of closing.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I am the final speaker on our side, so I will proceed.

May I inquire how much time I have remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has 7 minutes remaining.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I will urge all Members of this House to vote "no" on the previous question so that I can amend the rule and allow the House to vote on H.R. 2429, the Miller-Owens bill to increase the Federal minimum wage for the first time in nearly a decade. We have the time. According to the schedule, we are out at 2 o'clock today. The American workers deserve a pay increase.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of the amendment and extraneous materials immediately prior to the vote on the previous question.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, my amendment provides that immediately after the House adopts this rule it will bring H.R. 2429 to the House floor for an up or down vote. This bill will gradually increase the minimum wage from the current level of \$5.15 an hour to \$7.25 after about 2 years. The amendment also phases in coverage of the Federal minimum wage for the Commonwealth of the Northern Marianas.

Mr. Speaker, how long are we going to wait before we start helping American workers and their families? Instead of passing significant legislation week after week, or, even worse, enacting bills to make the richest of this Nation even richer, when are we going to do something that is meaningful for the average American worker? It is simply disgraceful that less than 1 month ago we passed yet another massive tax break for our Nation's multimillionaires, but failed to help those American families who earn the least. In fact, the leadership of this House actually blocked consideration of a bill that contained an increase in the minimum wage. The leadership of this House actually and affirmatively went out there and blocked a bill that contained an increase in the minimum wage.

It is getting harder and harder and harder every day for those making at or near minimum wage to make ends meet. It doesn't take a genius to figure out that paying \$3 or more for a gallon

of gas by itself can eat up a \$5.15-an-hour paycheck. And we all know that, when gas prices increase, it has a ripple effect throughout the country, increasing costs for food and other necessities in life.

Mr. Speaker, just yesterday The Washington Post reported on a new study that shows that in the Washington, D.C. area, wages are rising more than twice as fast for highly paid employees as they are for workers. These people need our help, and they need it immediately. Let's not allow any more time to go by before we do the right thing and adopt an immediate increase in the minimum wage. Let's show the American people that we are looking out for their best interests. And we can do this today, Mr. Speaker, if we vote down the previous question and amend the rule.

I urge all Members of this body to vote "no" on the previous question so we can help the 7 million-plus American workers who will directly benefit from an increase in the minimum wage.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Speaker, I rise again in support of this rule and in recognition of the importance of this underlying bill. I want to again commend Chairman OXLEY and Chairman SENBRENNER for their stewardship of the bill, as well as Representatives LEACH and GOODLATTE, the sponsors of the bill.

H.R. 4411 goes a long way to modernize and clarify existing law, to turn back the tide of offshore Internet gambling sites that penetrate our borders and computers across this country with virtually no legal oversight. These organizations have the ability to prey on children as well as those citizens who suffer from a gambling addiction, and they must be stopped.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 4411 does a very good job of getting at the root of the problem and targeting those organizations that enable this illicit activity by tightening legal definitions and toughening the penalties for violations. This bill achieves these ends while also preserving the rights of our States and their regulatory powers. So for the sake of minors who might be lured into gambling, and, in truth, citizens of all ages, I want to encourage my colleagues to support both this rule and the underlying bill.

The material previously referred to by Mr. MCGOVERN is as follows:

PREVIOUS QUESTION ON H. RES. 907, RULE FOR H.R. 4411 UNLAWFUL INTERNET GAMBLING ENFORCEMENT ACT OF 2006

At the end of the resolution add the following new section:

"Sec. 2. Immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order without intervention of any point of order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 2429) to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to provide for an increase in the Federal minimum wage. The bill shall be considered as read for amendment. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the

bill to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) 60 minutes of debate equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce; and (2) one motion to recommit with or without instructions."

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT IT REALLY MEANS

This vote, the vote on whether to order the previous question on a special rule, is not merely a procedural vote. A vote against ordering the previous question is a vote against the Republican majority agenda and a vote to allow the opposition, at least for the moment, to offer an alternative plan. It is a vote about what the House should be debating.

Mr. Clarence Cannon's *Precedents of the House of Representatives*, (VI, 308-311) describes the vote on the previous question on the rule as "a motion to direct or control the consideration of the subject before the House being made by the Member in charge." To defeat the previous question is to give the opposition a chance to decide the subject before the House. Cannon cites the Speaker's ruling of January 13, 1920, to the effect that "the refusal of the House to sustain the demand for the previous question passes the control of the resolution to the opposition" in order to offer an amendment. On March 15, 1909, a member of the majority party offered a rule resolution. The House defeated the previous question and a member of the opposition rose to a parliamentary inquiry, asking who was entitled to recognition. Speaker Joseph G. Cannon (R-Illinois) said: "The previous question having been refused, the gentleman from New York, Mr. Fitzgerald, who had asked the gentleman to yield to him for an amendment, is entitled to the first recognition."

Because the vote today may look bad for the Republican majority they will say "the vote on the previous question is simply a vote on whether to proceed to an immediate vote on adopting the resolution * * * [and] has no substantive legislative or policy implications whatsoever." But that is not what they have always said. Listen to the Republican Leadership Manual on the Legislative Process in the United States House of Representatives, (6th edition, page 135). Here's how the Republicans describe the previous question vote in their own manual: Although it is generally not possible to amend the rule because the majority Member controlling the time will not yield for the purpose of offering an amendment, the same result may be achieved by voting down the previous question on the rule * * * When the motion for the previous question is defeated, control of the time passes to the Member who led the opposition to ordering the previous question. That Member, because he then controls the time, may offer an amendment to the rule, or yield for the purpose of amendment."

Deschler's Procedure in the U.S. House of Representatives, the subchapter titled "Amending Special Rules" states: "a refusal to order the previous question on such a rule [a special rule reported from the Committee on Rules] opens the resolution to amendment and further debate." (Chapter 21, section 21.2) Section 21.3 continues: Upon rejection of the motion for the previous question on a resolution reported from the Committee on Rules, control shifts to the Member leading the opposition to the previous question, who may offer a proper amendment or motion and who controls the time for debate thereon."

Clearly, the vote on the previous question on a rule does have substantive policy implications. It is the one of the only available

tools for those who oppose the Republican majority's agenda to offer an alternative plan.

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for electronic voting, if ordered, on the question of adoption of the resolution.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 214, nays 189, not voting 29, as follows:

[Roll No. 360]

YEAS—214

Aderholt	Emerson	LaTourette
Akin	English (PA)	Lewis (CA)
Alexander	Everett	Lewis (KY)
Bachus	Feeney	Linder
Baker	Ferguson	LoBiondo
Barrett (SC)	Fitzpatrick (PA)	Lucas
Bartlett (MD)	Flake	Lungren, Daniel E.
Barton (TX)	Foley	Mack
Bass	Fortenberry	Manzullo
Beauprez	Fossella	Marchant
Biggart	Fox	McCaul (TX)
Bilbray	Franks (AZ)	McCotter
Bilirakis	Frelinghuysen	McCrery
Bishop (UT)	Gallely	McHenry
Blackburn	Garrett (NJ)	McHugh
Blunt	Gerlach	McKeon
Boehlert	Gibbons	McMorris
Boehner	Gilchrest	Mica
Bonilla	Gillmor	Miller (FL)
Bonner	Gingrey	Miller (MI)
Bono	Gohmert	Miller, Gary
Boozman	Goodlatte	Moran (KS)
Boustany	Granger	Murphy
Bradley (NH)	Graves	Musgrave
Brady (TX)	Gutknecht	Myrick
Brown (SC)	Hall	Neugebauer
Brown-Waite,	Harris	Ney
Ginny	Hart	Northup
Burgess	Hastings (WA)	Norwood
Burton (IN)	Hayes	Nunes
Buyer	Hayworth	Osborne
Calvert	Hefley	Otter
Camp (MI)	Hensarling	Oxley
Campbell (CA)	Herger	Paul
Cannon	Hobson	Pearce
Cantor	Hoekstra	Pence
Capito	Hostettler	Peterson (PA)
Carter	Hulshof	Petri
Castle	Hunter	Pickering
Chabot	Inglis (SC)	Pitts
Choccola	Issa	Platts
Coble	Jindal	Poe
Cole (OK)	Johnson (CT)	Pombo
Conaway	Johnson (IL)	Porter
Crenshaw	Johnson, Sam	Price (GA)
Cubin	Jones (NC)	Pryce (OH)
Culberson	Keller	Putnam
Davis (KY)	Kennedy (MN)	Ramstad
Davis, Tom	King (IA)	Regula
Deal (GA)	King (NY)	Rehberg
Dent	Kingston	Reichert
Diaz-Balart, L.	Kirk	Renzi
Diaz-Balart, M.	Kline	Reynolds
Doolittle	Knollenberg	Rogers (AL)
Drake	Kolbe	Rogers (KY)
Dreier	Kuhl (NY)	Rogers (MI)
Duncan	LaHood	Rohrabacher
Ehlers	Latham	

Ros-Lehtinen	Simpson
Royce	Smith (TX)
Ryan (WI)	Sodrel
Ryun (KS)	Souder
Saxton	Stearns
Schmidt	Sweeney
Schwarz (MI)	Tancredo
Sensenbrenner	Taylor (NC)
Shadegg	Terry
Shaw	Thomas
Sherwood	Thornberry
Shimkus	Tiberi
Shuster	Turner
Simmons	Upton

NAYS—189

Abercrombie	Green, Al	Oberstar
Ackerman	Green, Gene	Obey
Allen	Grijalva	Oliver
Andrews	Harman	Ortiz
Baca	Hastings (FL)	Pallone
Baird	Herseeth	Pascarell
Baldwin	Higgins	Pastor
Barrow	Holden	Payne
Bean	Holt	Pelosi
Becerra	Honda	Peterson (MN)
Berkley	Hooley	Pomeroy
Berman	Hoyer	Price (NC)
Berry	Inslee	Rahall
Bishop (GA)	Israel	Reyes
Bishop (NY)	Jackson (IL)	Ross
Blumenauer	Jackson-Lee	Rothman
Boren	(TX)	Rothman
Boswell	Jefferson	Roybal-Allard
Boucher	Johnson, E. B.	Ruppersberger
Boyd	Kanjorski	Rush
Brady (PA)	Kaptur	Ryan (OH)
Brown (OH)	Kennedy (RI)	Sabo
Brown, Corrine	Kildee	Salazar
Butterfield	Kilpatrick (MI)	Sanchez, Linda T.
Capps	Kind	Sanchez, Loretta
Capuano	Kucinich	Sanders
Cardin	Langevin	Schakowsky
Cardoza	Lantos	Schiff
Carnahan	Larsen (WA)	Schwartz (PA)
Carson	Larson (CT)	Scott (GA)
Case	Leach	Scott (VA)
Chandler	Lee	Serrano
Clay	Levin	Shays
Cleaver	Lewis (GA)	Sherman
Clyburn	Lipinski	Skelton
Conyers	Lofgren, Zoe	Smith (WA)
Cooper	Lowe	Snyder
Costa	Lynch	Solis
Costello	Maloney	Spratt
Cramer	Markey	Stark
Crowley	Marshall	Stupak
Cuellar	Matheson	Tanner
Cummings	Matsui	Tauscher
Davis (AL)	McCarthy	Taylor (MS)
Davis (CA)	McCollum (MN)	Thompson (CA)
Davis (IL)	McDermott	Thompson (MS)
Davis (TN)	McGovern	Tierney
DeFazio	McIntyre	Towns
DeGette	McKinney	Udall (CO)
Delahunt	Meehan	Udall (NM)
DeLauro	Meek (FL)	Van Hollen
Dingell	Meeks (NY)	Velázquez
Doggett	Melancon	Visclosky
Edwards	Michaud	Wasserman
Emanuel	Millender	Schultz
Engel	McDonald	Waters
Eshoo	Miller, George	Watson
Etheridge	Mollohan	Watt
Farr	Moore (KS)	Waxman
Fattah	Moore (WI)	Weiner
Filner	Moran (VA)	Woolsey
Ford	Murtha	Wu
Frank (MA)	Nadler	Wynn
Gonzalez	Napolitano	
Gordon	Neal (MA)	

NOT VOTING—29

Davis (FL)	Hinojosa	Radanovich
Davis, Jo Ann	Hyde	Rangel
Dicks	Istook	Sessions
Doyle	Jenkins	Slaughter
Evans	Jones (OH)	Smith (NJ)
Forbes	Kelly	Strickland
Goode	McNulty	Sullivan
Green (WI)	Miller (NC)	Tiahrt
Gutierrez	Nussle	Wexler
Hinchey	Owens	

□ 1210

Mr. PALLONE changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. REHBERG). The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MAKING IN ORDER POSTPONE- MENT OF FURTHER CONSIDER- ATION OF H.R. 4411, INTERNET GAMBLING PROHIBITION AND ENFORCEMENT ACT

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that during consideration of H.R. 4411, pursuant to House Resolution 907, notwithstanding the ordering of the previous question, it may be in order at any time for the Chair to postpone further consideration of the bill until a later time to be designated by the Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. OXLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 4411.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

INTERNET GAMBLING PROHIBI- TION AND ENFORCEMENT ACT

Mr. OXLEY. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 907, I call up the bill (H.R. 4411) to prevent the use of certain payment instruments, credit cards, and fund transfers for unlawful Internet gambling, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 4411

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Unlawful Internet Gambling Enforcement Act of 2005".

SEC. 2. PROHIBITION ON ACCEPTANCE OF ANY PAYMENT INSTRUMENT FOR UNLAW- FUL INTERNET GAMBLING.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 53 of title 31, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new subchapter:

"SUBCHAPTER IV—PROHIBITION ON FUNDING OF UNLAWFUL INTERNET GAMBLING

"§ 5361. Congressional findings and purpose

"(a) FINDINGS.—The Congress finds the following:

"(1) Internet gambling is primarily funded through personal use of payment system instruments, credit cards, and wire transfers.

"(2) The National Gambling Impact Study Commission in 1999 recommended the passage of legislation to prohibit wire transfers

to Internet gambling sites or the banks which represent such sites.

"(3) Internet gambling is a growing cause of debt collection problems for insured depository institutions and the consumer credit industry.

"(4) New mechanisms for enforcing gambling laws on the Internet are necessary because traditional law enforcement mechanisms are often inadequate for enforcing gambling prohibitions or regulations on the Internet, especially where such gambling crosses State or national borders.

"(b) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—No provision of this subchapter shall be construed as altering, limiting, or extending any Federal or State law or Tribal-State compact prohibiting, permitting, or regulating gambling within the United States.

"§ 5362. Definitions

"In this subchapter, the following definitions shall apply:

"(1) BET OR WAGER.—The term 'bet or wager'—

"(A) means the staking or risking by any person of something of value upon the outcome of a contest of others, a sporting event, or a game subject to chance, upon an agreement or understanding that the person or another person will receive something of value in the event of a certain outcome;

"(B) includes the purchase of a chance or opportunity to win a lottery or other prize (which opportunity to win is predominantly subject to chance);

"(C) includes any scheme of a type described in section 3702 of title 28;

"(D) includes any instructions or information pertaining to the establishment or movement of funds by the bettor or customer in, to, or from an account with the business of betting or wagering; and

"(E) does not include—

"(i) any activity governed by the securities laws (as that term is defined in section 3(a)(47) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 for the purchase or sale of securities (as that term is defined in section 3(a)(10) of that Act);

"(ii) any transaction conducted on or subject to the rules of a registered entity or exempt board of trade under the Commodity Exchange Act;

"(iii) any over-the-counter derivative instrument;

"(iv) any other transaction that—

"(I) is excluded or exempt from regulation under the Commodity Exchange Act; or

"(II) is exempt from State gaming or bucket shop laws under section 12(e) of the Commodity Exchange Act or section 28(a) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934;

"(v) any contract of indemnity or guarantee;

"(vi) any contract for insurance;

"(vii) any deposit or other transaction with an insured depository institution; or

"(viii) any participation in a simulation sports game, an educational game, or a contest, that—

"(I) is not dependent solely on the outcome of any single sporting event or nonparticipant's singular individual performance in any single sporting event;

"(II) has an outcome that reflects the relative knowledge of the participants, or their skill at physical reaction or physical manipulation (but not chance), and, in the case of a simulation sports game, has an outcome that is determined predominantly by accumulated statistical results of sporting events; and

"(III) offers a prize or award to a participant that is established in advance of the game or contest and is not determined by the number of participants or the amount of any fees paid by those participants.

"(2) BUSINESS OF BETTING OR WAGERING.—The term 'business of betting or wagering' does not include a financial transaction provider, or any interactive computer service or telecommunications service.

"(3) DESIGNATED PAYMENT SYSTEM.—The term 'designated payment system' means any system utilized by a financial transaction provider that the Secretary, in consultation with the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System and the Attorney General, determines, by regulation or order, could be utilized in connection with, or to facilitate, any restricted transaction.

"(4) FINANCIAL TRANSACTION PROVIDER.—The term 'financial transaction provider' means a creditor, credit card issuer, financial institution, operator of a terminal at which an electronic fund transfer may be initiated, money transmitting business, or international, national, regional, or local network utilized to effect a credit transaction, electronic fund transfer, stored value product transaction, or money transmitting service, or a participant in such network, or other participant in a designated payment system.

"(5) INTERNET.—The term 'Internet' means the international computer network of interoperable packet switched data networks.

"(6) INTERACTIVE COMPUTER SERVICE.—The term 'interactive computer service' has the same meaning as in section 230(f) of the Communications Act of 1934.

"(7) RESTRICTED TRANSACTION.—The term 'restricted transaction' means any transaction or transmittal involving any credit, funds, instrument, or proceeds described in any paragraph of section 5363 which the recipient is prohibited from accepting under section 5363.

"(8) SECRETARY.—The term 'Secretary' means the Secretary of the Treasury.

"(9) UNLAWFUL INTERNET GAMBLING.—

"(A) IN GENERAL.—The term 'unlawful Internet gambling' means to place, receive, or otherwise knowingly transmit a bet or wager by any means which involves the use, at least in part, of the Internet where such bet or wager is unlawful under any applicable Federal or State law in the State or Tribal lands in which the bet or wager is initiated, received, or otherwise made.

"(B) INTRASTATE TRANSACTIONS.—The term 'unlawful Internet gambling' shall not include placing, receiving, or otherwise transmitting a bet or wager where—

"(i) the bet or wager is initiated and received or otherwise made exclusively within a single State;

"(ii) the bet or wager and the method by which the bet or wager is initiated and received or otherwise made is expressly authorized by and placed in accordance with the laws of such State, and the State law or regulations include—

"(I) age and location verification requirements reasonably designed to block access to minors and persons located out of such State; and

"(II) appropriate data security standards to prevent unauthorized access by any person whose age and current location has not been verified in accordance with such State's law or regulations; and

"(iii) the bet or wager does not violate any provision of the—

"(I) Interstate Horseracing Act;

"(II) Professional and Amateur Sports Protection Act;

"(III) Gambling Devices Transportation Act; or

"(IV) Indian Gaming Regulatory Act.

"(C) INTRATRIBAL TRANSACTIONS.—The term 'unlawful Internet gambling' shall not include placing, receiving, or otherwise transmitting a bet or wager where—

“(i) the bet or wager is initiated and received or otherwise made exclusively—

“(I) within the Indian lands of a single Indian tribe (as those terms are defined by the Indian Gaming Regulatory Act); or

“(II) between the Indian lands of 2 or more Indian tribes to the extent that intertribal gaming is authorized by the Indian Gaming Regulatory Act;

“(ii) the bet or wager and the method by which the bet or wager is initiated and received or otherwise made is expressly authorized by and complies with the requirements of—

“(I) the applicable tribal ordinance or resolution approved by the Chairman of the National Indian Gaming Commission; and

“(II) with respect to class III gaming, the applicable Tribal-State Compact;

“(iii) the applicable tribal ordinance or resolution or Tribal-State compact includes—

“(I) age and location verification requirements reasonably designed to block access to minors and persons located out of the applicable Tribal lands; and

“(II) appropriate data security standards to prevent unauthorized access by any person whose age and current location has not been verified in accordance with the applicable tribal ordinance or resolution or Tribal-State Compact; and

“(iv) the bet or wager does not violate any provision of the—

“(I) Interstate Horseracing Act;

“(II) the Professional and Amateur Sports Protection Act;

“(III) the Gambling Devices Transportation Act; or

“(IV) the Indian Gaming Regulatory Act.

“(D) INTERSTATE HORSE RACING.—The term ‘unlawful Internet gambling’ shall not include placing, receiving, or otherwise transmitting a bet or wager that is governed by and complies with the Interstate Horseracing Act of 1978.

“(E) INTERMEDIATE ROUTING.—The intermediate routing of electronic data shall not determine the location or locations in which a bet or wager is initiated, received, or otherwise made.

“(10) OTHER TERMS.—

“(A) CREDIT; CREDITOR; CREDIT CARD; AND CARD ISSUER.—The terms ‘credit’, ‘creditor’, ‘credit card’, and ‘card issuer’ have the same meanings as in section 103 of the Truth in Lending Act.

“(B) ELECTRONIC FUND TRANSFER.—The term ‘electronic fund transfer’—

“(i) has the same meaning as in section 903 of the Electronic Fund Transfer Act, except that such term includes transfers that would otherwise be excluded under section 903(6)(E) of that Act; and

“(ii) includes any fund transfer covered by Article 4A of the Uniform Commercial Code, as in effect in any State.

“(C) FINANCIAL INSTITUTION.—The term ‘financial institution’ has the same meaning as in section 903 of the Electronic Fund Transfer Act, except that such term does not include a casino, sports book, or other business at or through which bets or wagers may be placed or received.

“(D) INSURED DEPOSITORY INSTITUTION.—The term ‘insured depository institution’—

“(i) has the same meaning as in section 3 of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act; and

“(ii) includes an insured credit union (as defined in section 101 of the Federal Credit Union Act).

“(E) MONEY TRANSMITTING BUSINESS AND MONEY TRANSMITTING SERVICE.—The terms ‘money transmitting business’ and ‘money transmitting service’ have the same meanings as in section 5330(d) (determined without regard to any regulations issued by the Secretary thereunder).

“§ 5363. Prohibition on acceptance of any financial instrument for unlawful Internet gambling

“No person engaged in the business of betting or wagering may knowingly accept, in connection with the participation of another person in unlawful Internet gambling—

“(1) credit, or the proceeds of credit, extended to or on behalf of such other person (including credit extended through the use of a credit card);

“(2) an electronic fund transfer, or funds transmitted by or through a money transmitting business, or the proceeds of an electronic fund transfer or money transmitting service, from or on behalf of such other person;

“(3) any check, draft, or similar instrument which is drawn by or on behalf of such other person and is drawn on or payable at or through any financial institution; or

“(4) the proceeds of any other form of financial transaction, as the Secretary may prescribe by regulation, which involves a financial institution as a payor or financial intermediary on behalf of or for the benefit of such other person.

“§ 5364. Policies and procedures to identify and prevent restricted transactions

“(a) REGULATIONS.—Before the end of the 270-day period beginning on the date of the enactment of this subchapter, the Secretary, in consultation with the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System and the Attorney General, shall prescribe regulations requiring each designated payment system, and all participants therein, to identify and prevent restricted transactions through the establishment of policies and procedures reasonably designed to identify and prevent restricted transactions in any of the following ways:

“(1) The establishment of policies and procedures that—

“(A) allow the payment system and any person involved in the payment system to identify restricted transactions by means of codes in authorization messages or by other means; and

“(B) block restricted transactions identified as a result of the policies and procedures developed pursuant to subparagraph (A).

“(2) The establishment of policies and procedures that prevent the acceptance of the products or services of the payment system in connection with a restricted transaction.

“(b) REQUIREMENTS FOR POLICIES AND PROCEDURES.—In prescribing regulations under subsection (a), the Secretary shall—

“(1) identify types of policies and procedures, including nonexclusive examples, which would be deemed, as applicable, to be reasonably designed to identify, block, or prevent the acceptance of the products or services with respect to each type of restricted transaction;

“(2) to the extent practical, permit any participant in a payment system to choose among alternative means of identifying and blocking, or otherwise preventing the acceptance of the products or services of the payment system or participant in connection with, restricted transactions; and

“(3) consider exempting restricted transactions from any requirement imposed under such regulations, if the Secretary finds that it is not reasonably practical to identify and block, or otherwise prevent, such transactions.

“(c) COMPLIANCE WITH PAYMENT SYSTEM POLICIES AND PROCEDURES.—A financial transaction provider shall be considered to be in compliance with the regulations prescribed under subsection (a), if—

“(1) such person relies on and complies with the policies and procedures of a designated payment system of which it is a member or participant to—

“(A) identify and block restricted transactions; or

“(B) otherwise prevent the acceptance of the products or services of the payment system, member, or participant in connection with restricted transactions; and

“(2) such policies and procedures of the designated payment system comply with the requirements of regulations prescribed under subsection (a).

“(d) NO LIABILITY FOR BLOCKING OR REFUSING TO HONOR RESTRICTED TRANSACTIONS.—A person that is subject to a regulation prescribed or order issued under this subchapter and blocks, or otherwise refuses to honor a transaction—

“(1) that is a restricted transaction;

“(2) that such person reasonably believes to be a restricted transaction; or

“(3) as a member of a designated payment system in reliance on the policies and procedures of the payment system, in an effort to comply with regulations prescribed under subsection (a), shall not be liable to any party for such action.

“(e) REGULATORY ENFORCEMENT.—The requirements of this section shall be enforced exclusively by the Federal functional regulators and the Federal Trade Commission, in the manner provided in section 505(a) of the Gramm-Leach-Bliley Act.

“§ 5365. Civil remedies

“(a) JURISDICTION.—The district courts of the United States shall have original and exclusive jurisdiction to prevent and restrain violations of this subchapter by issuing appropriate orders in accordance with this section, regardless of whether a prosecution has been initiated under this subchapter.

“(b) PROCEEDINGS.—

“(1) INSTITUTION BY FEDERAL GOVERNMENT.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The United States, acting through the Attorney General, may institute proceedings under this section to prevent or restrain a violation or a threatened violation of this subchapter.

“(B) RELIEF.—Upon application of the United States under this paragraph, the district court may enter a preliminary injunction or an injunction against any person to prevent or restrain a violation or threatened violation of this subchapter, in accordance with rule 65 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.

“(2) INSTITUTION BY STATE ATTORNEY GENERAL.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The attorney general (or other appropriate State official) of a State in which a violation of this subchapter allegedly has occurred or will occur may institute proceedings under this section to prevent or restrain the violation or threatened violation.

“(B) RELIEF.—Upon application of the attorney general (or other appropriate State official) of an affected State under this paragraph, the district court may enter a preliminary injunction or an injunction against any person to prevent or restrain a violation or threatened violation of this subchapter, in accordance with rule 65 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.

“(3) INDIAN LANDS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding paragraphs (1) and (2), for a violation of this subchapter that is alleged to have occurred, or may occur, on Indian lands (as that term is defined in section 4 of the Indian Gaming Regulatory Act)—

“(i) the United States shall have the enforcement authority provided under paragraph (1); and

“(ii) the enforcement authorities specified in an applicable Tribal-State compact negotiated under section 11 of the Indian Gaming

Regulatory Act (25 U.S.C. 2710) shall be carried out in accordance with that compact.

“(B) **RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.**—No provision of this section shall be construed as altering, superseding, or otherwise affecting the application of the Indian Gaming Regulatory Act.

“(c) **EXPEDITED PROCEEDINGS.**—In addition to any proceeding under subsection (b), a district court may, in exigent circumstances, enter a temporary restraining order against a person alleged to be in violation of this subchapter, upon application of the United States under subsection (b)(1), or the attorney general (or other appropriate State official) of an affected State under subsection (b)(2), in accordance with rule 65(b) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.

“(d) **LIMITATION RELATING TO INTERACTIVE COMPUTER SERVICES.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Relief granted under this section against an interactive computer service shall—

“(A) be limited to the removal of, or disabling of access to, an online site violating this subchapter, or a hypertext link to an online site violating this subchapter, that resides on a computer server that such service controls or operates, except that the limitation in this subparagraph shall not apply if the service is subject to liability under this section under section 5367;

“(B) be available only after notice to the interactive computer service and an opportunity for the service to appear are provided;

“(C) not impose any obligation on an interactive computer service to monitor its service or to affirmatively seek facts indicating activity violating this subchapter;

“(D) specify the interactive computer service to which it applies; and

“(E) specifically identify the location of the online site or hypertext link to be removed or access to which is to be disabled.

“(2) **COORDINATION WITH OTHER LAW.**—An interactive computer service that does not violate this subchapter shall not be liable under section 1084(d) of title 18, except that the limitation in this paragraph shall not apply if an interactive computer service has actual knowledge and control of bets and wagers and—

“(A) operates, manages, supervises, or directs an Internet website at which unlawful bets or wagers may be placed, received, or otherwise made or at which unlawful bets or wagers are offered to be placed, received, or otherwise made; or

“(B) owns or controls, or is owned or controlled by, any person who operates, manages, supervises, or directs an Internet website at which unlawful bets or wagers may be placed, received, or otherwise made, or at which unlawful bets or wagers are offered to be placed, received, or otherwise made.

“(e) **LIMITATION ON INJUNCTIONS AGAINST REGULATED PERSONS.**—Notwithstanding any other provision of this section, and subject to section 5367, no provision of this subchapter shall be construed as authorizing the Attorney General of the United States, or the attorney general (or other appropriate State official) of any State to institute proceedings to prevent or restrain a violation or threatened violation of this subchapter against any financial transaction provider with respect to the designated payment system (or systems) of the financial transaction provider.

“§ 5366. Criminal penalties

“(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Whoever violates section 5363 shall be fined under title 18, or imprisoned for not more than 5 years, or both.

“(b) **PERMANENT INJUNCTION.**—Upon conviction of a person under this section, the court may enter a permanent injunction enjoining such person from placing, receiving, or oth-

erwise making bets or wagers or sending, receiving, or inviting information assisting in the placing of bets or wagers.

“§ 5367. Circumventions prohibited

“Notwithstanding section 5362(2), a financial transaction provider, or any interactive computer service or telecommunications service, may be liable under this subchapter if such person has actual knowledge and control of bets and wagers, and—

“(1) operates, manages, supervises, or directs an Internet website at which unlawful bets or wagers may be placed, received, or otherwise made, or at which unlawful bets or wagers are offered to be placed, received, or otherwise made; or

“(2) owns or controls, or is owned or controlled by, any person who operates, manages, supervises, or directs an Internet website at which unlawful bets or wagers may be placed, received, or otherwise made, or at which unlawful bets or wagers are offered to be placed, received, or otherwise made.”.

(b) **TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENT.**—The table of sections for chapter 53 of title 31, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“SUBCHAPTER IV—PROHIBITION ON FUNDING OF UNLAWFUL INTERNET GAMBLING

“5361. Congressional findings and purpose.

“5362. Definitions.

“5363. Prohibition on acceptance of any financial instrument for unlawful Internet gambling.

“5364. Policies and procedures to identify and prevent restricted transactions.

“5365. Civil remedies.

“5366. Criminal penalties.

“5367. Circumventions prohibited.”.

SEC. 4. INTERNET GAMBLING IN OR THROUGH FOREIGN JURISDICTIONS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—In deliberations between the United States Government and any other country on money laundering, corruption, and crime issues, the United States Government should—

(1) encourage cooperation by foreign governments and relevant international fora in identifying whether Internet gambling operations are being used for money laundering, corruption, or other crimes;

(2) advance policies that promote the co-operation of foreign governments, through information sharing or other measures, in the enforcement of this Act; and

(3) encourage the Financial Action Task Force on Money Laundering, in its annual report on money laundering typologies, to study the extent to which Internet gambling operations are being used for money laundering purposes.

(b) **REPORT REQUIRED.**—The Secretary of the Treasury shall submit an annual report to the Congress on any deliberations between the United States and other countries on issues relating to Internet gambling.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. In lieu of the amendments recommended by the Committees on Financial Services and the Judiciary printed in the bill, the amendment in the nature of a substitute depicted in the Rules Committee Print dated July 5, 2006, is adopted. Pursuant to House Resolution 907, the bill, as amended, is considered read.

The text of the bill, as amended, is as follows:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE AND TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) **SHORT TITLE.**—This Act may be cited as the “Internet Gambling Prohibition and Enforcement Act”.

(b) **TABLE OF CONTENTS.**—The table of contents is as follows:

Sec. 1. Short title and table of contents.

TITLE I—MODERNIZATION, OF THE WIRE ACT OF 1961

Sec. 101. Definitions.

Sec. 102. Modification of existing prohibition.

Sec. 103. Authorization of civil enforcement.

Sec. 104. Authorization of appropriations.

Sec. 105. Rules of construction.

Sec. 106. Sense of Congress.

TITLE II—POLICIES AND PROCEDURES REQUIRED TO PREVENT PAYMENTS FOR UNLAWFUL GAMBLING

Sec. 201. Policies and procedures required to prevent payments for unlawful gambling.

Sec. 202. Technical and conforming amendment.

TITLE III—INTERNET GAMBLING IN OR THROUGH FOREIGN JURISDICTIONS

Sec. 301. Internet gambling in or through foreign jurisdictions.

TITLE I—MODERNIZATION OF THE WIRE ACT OF 1961

Sec. 101. DEFINITIONS.

Section 1081 of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by designating the five undesignated paragraphs that begin with “The term” as paragraphs (1) through (5), respectively;

(2) by amending paragraph (5), as so designated, to read as follows:

“(5) The term ‘communication facility’ means any and all instrumentalities, personnel, and services (among other things, the receipt, forwarding, or delivery of communications) used or useful in the transmission of writings, signs, pictures, and sounds of all kinds by aid of wire, cable, radio, or an electromagnetic, photoelectronic or photooptical system, or other like connection (whether fixed or mobile) between the points of origin and reception of such transmission.”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(6) The term ‘bets or wagers’—

“(A) means the staking or risking by any person of something of value upon the outcome of a contest of others, a sporting event, or a game predominantly subject to chance, upon an agreement or understanding that the person or another person will receive something of value in the event of a certain outcome;

“(B) includes the purchase of a chance or opportunity to win a lottery or other prize (which opportunity to win is predominantly subject to chance);

“(C) includes any scheme of a type described in section 3702 of title 28; and

“(D) does not include—

“(i) any activity governed by the securities laws (as that term is defined in section 3(a)(47) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934) for the purchase or sale of securities (as that term is defined in section 3(a)(10) of that Act);

“(ii) any transaction conducted on or subject to the rules of a registered entity or exempt board of trade under the Commodity Exchange Act;

“(iii) any over-the-counter derivative instrument;

“(iv) any other transaction that—

“(I) is excluded or exempt from regulation under the Commodity Exchange Act; or

“(II) is exempt from State gaming or bucket shop laws under section 12(e) of the Commodity Exchange Act or section 28(a) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934;

“(v) any contract of indemnity or guarantee;

“(vi) any contract for insurance;
 “(vii) any deposit or other transaction with an insured depository institution;
 “(viii) participation in any game or contest in which participants do not stake or risk anything of value other than—

“(I) personal efforts of the participants in playing the game or contest or obtaining access to the Internet; or

“(II) points or credits that the sponsor of the game or contest provides to participants free of charge and that can be used or redeemed only for participation in games or contests offered by the sponsor; or

“(ix) participation in any fantasy or simulation sports game or educational game or contest in which (if the game or contest involves a team or teams) no fantasy or simulation sports team is based on the current membership of an actual team that is a member of an amateur or professional sports organization (as those terms are defined in section 3701 of title 28) and that meets the following conditions:

“(I) All prizes and awards offered to winning participants are established and made known to the participants in advance of the game or contest and their value is not determined by the number of participants or the amount of any fees paid by those participants.

“(II) All winning outcomes reflect the relative knowledge and skill of the participants and are determined predominantly by accumulated statistical results of the performance of individuals (athletes in the case of sports events) in multiple real-world sporting or other events.

“(III) No winning outcome is based—

“(aa) on the score, point-spread, or any performance or performances of any single real-world team or any combination of such teams; or

“(bb) solely on any single performance of an individual in any single real-world sporting or other event.

“(7) The terms ‘credit’, ‘creditor’, ‘credit card’, and ‘card issuer’ have the same meanings as in section 103 of the Truth in Lending Act.

“(8) The term ‘electronic fund transfer’—

“(A) has the same meaning as in section 903 of the Electronic Fund Transfer Act, except that such term includes transfers that would otherwise be excluded under section 903(6)(E) of that Act; and

“(B) includes any fund transfer covered by Article 4A of the Uniform Commercial Code, as in effect in any State.

“(9) The term ‘financial institution’ has the same meaning as in section 903 of the Electronic Fund Transfer Act, except that such term does not include a casino, sports book, or other business at or through which bets or wagers may be placed or received.

“(10) The term ‘financial transaction provider’ has the same meaning as in section 5361 of title 31 (as added by title II of this Act).

“(11) The term ‘foreign jurisdiction’ means a jurisdiction of a foreign country or political subdivision thereof.

“(12) The term ‘gambling business’ means a business of betting or wagering.

“(13) The term ‘information assisting in the placing of bets or wagers’ means information knowingly transmitted by an individual in a gambling business that enables or facilitates a bet or wager and does not include—

“(A) any posting or reporting of any educational information on how to make a legal bet or wager or the nature of betting or wagering, as long as such posting or reporting does not solicit or provide information for the purpose of facilitating or enabling the placing or receipt of bets or wagers in a jurisdiction where such betting is illegal; or

“(B) advertising relating to betting or wagering in a jurisdiction where such betting or wagering is legal, as long as such advertising does not solicit or provide information for the purpose of facilitating or enabling the placing or receipt of bets or wagers in a jurisdiction where such betting is illegal.

“(14) The term ‘insured depository institution’—

“(A) has the same meaning as in section 3 of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act; and

“(B) includes an insured credit union (as defined in section 101 of the Federal Credit Union Act).

“(15) The term ‘interactive computer service’ has the same meaning as in section 230(f) of the Communications Act of 1934.

“(16) The terms ‘money transmitting business’ and ‘money transmitting service’ have the same meanings as in section 5330(d) (determined without regard to any regulations prescribed by the Secretary thereunder).

“(17) The terms ‘own or control’ and to be ‘owned or controlled’ include circumstances within the meaning of section 2(a)(2) of the Bank Holding Company Act of 1956.

“(18) The term ‘person’ includes a government (including any governmental entity (as defined in section 3701(2) of title 28)).

“(19) The term ‘State’ means a State of the United States, the District of Columbia, or a commonwealth, territory, or possession of the United States.

“(20) The term ‘tribe’ or ‘tribal’ means an Indian tribe, as defined under section 4(5) of the Indian Gaming Regulatory Act of 1988).

“(21) For purposes of Section 1085(b), the term ‘account’ means—

“(A) the unpaid balance of money or its equivalent received or held by an insured depository institution in the usual course of business and for which it has given or is obligated to give credit, either conditionally or unconditionally, to an account, including interest credited, or which is evidenced by an instrument on which the depository institution is primarily liable; and

“(B) money received or held by an insured depository institution, or the credit given for money or its equivalent received or held by the insured depository institution in the usual course of business for a special or specific purpose, regardless of the legal relationships established thereby, including escrow funds, funds held as security for securities loaned by the depository institution, funds deposited as advance payment on subscriptions to United States Government securities, and funds held to meet its acceptances.”.

SEC. 102. MODIFICATION OF EXISTING PROHIBITION.

Section 1084 of title 18, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

“1084. Use of a communication facility to transmit bets or wagers; criminal penalties

“(a) Except as otherwise provided in this section, whoever, being engaged in a gambling business, knowingly—

“(1) uses a communication facility for the transmission in interstate or foreign commerce, within the special maritime and territorial jurisdiction of the United States, or to or from any place outside the jurisdiction of any nation with respect to any transmission to or from the United States, of—

“(A) bets or wagers;

“(B) information assisting in the placing of bets or wagers; or

“(C) a communication, which entitles the recipient to receive money or credit as a result of bets or wagers, or for information assisting in the placing of bets or wagers; or

“(2) accepts, in connection with the transmission of a communication in interstate or foreign commerce, within the special maritime and territorial jurisdiction of the

United States, or to or from any place outside the jurisdiction of any nation with respect to any transmission to or from the United States of bets or wagers or information assisting in the placing of bets or wagers—

“(A) credit, or the proceeds of credit, extended to or on behalf of another (including credit extended through the use of a credit card);

“(B) an electronic fund transfer or funds transmitted by or through a money transmitting business, or the proceeds of an electronic fund transfer or money transmitting service, from or on behalf of the other person;

“(C) any check, draft, or similar instrument which is drawn by or on behalf of the other person and is drawn on or payable through any financial institution; or

“(D) the proceeds of any other form of financial transaction as the Secretary of the Treasury and the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System may prescribe by regulation which involves a financial institution as a payor or financial intermediary on behalf of or for the benefit of the other person,

shall be fined under this title or imprisoned not more than five years, or both.

“(b) Nothing in this section prohibits—

“(1) the transmission of information assisting in the placing of bets or wagers for use in news reporting if such transmission does not solicit or provide information for the purpose of facilitating or enabling the placing or receipt of bets or wagers in a jurisdiction where such betting is illegal;

“(2) the transmission of information assisting in the placing of bets or wagers from a State or foreign country where such betting or wagering is permitted under Federal, State, tribal, or local law into a State or foreign country in which such betting on the same event is permitted under Federal, State, tribal, or local law; or

“(3) the interstate transmission of information relating to a State-specific lottery between a State or foreign country where such betting or wagering is permitted under Federal, State, tribal, or local law and an out-of-State data center for the purposes of assisting in the operation of such State-specific lottery.

“(c) Nothing in this section prohibits the use of a communication facility for the transmission of bets or wagers or information assisting in the placing of bets or wagers, if—

“(1) at the time the transmission occurs, the individual or entity placing the bets or wagers or information assisting in the placing of bets or wagers, the gambling business, and, subject to section 1084(b)(3), any individual or entity acting in concert with a gambling business to process the bets or wagers are physically located in the same State, and for class II or class III gaming under the Indian Gaming Regulatory Act, are physically located on Indian lands within that State;

“(2) the State or tribe has explicitly authorized such bets and wagers, the State or tribal law requires a secure and effective location and age verification system to assure compliance with age and location requirements, and the gambling business and any individual or entity acting in concert with a gambling business to process the bets or wagers complies with such law;

“(3) the State has explicitly authorized and licensed the operation of the gambling business and any individual or entity acting in concert with a gambling business to process the bets and wagers within its borders or the tribe has explicitly authorized and licensed the operation of the gambling business and

any individual or entity acting in concert with a gambling business to process the bets and wagers, on Indian lands within its jurisdiction;

“(4) with respect to class II or class III gaming, the game and gambling business complies with the requirements of the Indian Gaming Regulatory Act; and

“(5) with respect to class III gaming under the Indian Gaming Regulatory Act, the game is authorized under, and is conducted in accordance with, the respective Tribal-State compact of the Tribe having jurisdiction over the Indian lands where the individual or entity placing the bets or wagers or information assisting in the placing of bets or wagers, the gambling business, and any individual or entity acting in concert with a gambling business to process those bets or wagers are physically located, and such Tribal-State compact expressly provides that the game may be conducted using a communication facility to transmit bets or wagers information assisting in the placing of bets or wagers.

For purposes of this subsection, the intermediate routing of electronic data constituting or containing all or part of a bet or wager, or all or part of information assisting in the placing of bets or wagers, shall not determine the location or locations in which a bet or wager is transmitted, initiated, received or otherwise made; or from or to which a bet or wager, or information assisting in the placing of bets or wagers, is transmitted.

“(d) Nothing in this section creates immunity from criminal prosecution under any laws of any State or tribe.

“(e) Nothing in this section authorizes activity that is prohibited under chapter 178 of title 28, United States Code.

“(f) When any common carrier, subject to the jurisdiction of the Federal Communications Commission, is notified in writing by a Federal, State, tribal, or local law enforcement agency, acting within its jurisdiction, that any communication facility furnished by it is being used or will be used by its subscriber for the purpose of transmitting or receiving gambling information in interstate or foreign commerce, within the special maritime and territorial jurisdiction of the United States, or to or from any place outside the jurisdiction of any nation with respect to any transmission to or from the United States in violation of Federal, State, tribal, or local law, it shall discontinue or refuse, the leasing, furnishing, or maintaining of such facility, after reasonable notice to the subscriber, but no damages, penalty or forfeiture, civil or criminal, shall be found against any common carrier for any act done in compliance with any notice received from a law enforcement agency. Nothing in this section shall be deemed to prejudice the right of any person affected thereby to secure an appropriate determination, as otherwise provided by law, in a Federal court or in a State, tribal, or local tribunal or agency, that such facility should not be discontinued or removed, or should be restored.”

SEC. 103. AUTHORIZATION OF CIVIL ENFORCEMENT.

Chapter 50 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

§ 1085. Civil remedies

“(a) JURISDICTION.—The district courts of the United States (in addition to any other remedies under current law) shall have original and exclusive jurisdiction to prevent and restrain violations of section 1084 by issuing appropriate orders in accordance with this section, regardless of whether a prosecution has been initiated under section 1084.

“(b) PROCEEDINGS.—

“(1) The United States may institute proceedings under this section—

“(A) to obtain injunctive or declarative relief, including but not limited to a temporary restraining order and a preliminary injunction, against any person (other than a financial transaction provider) to prevent or restrain a violation or a threatened violation of section 1084;

“(B) in the case of an insured depository institution that is a financial transaction provider, to—

“(i) restrain an account maintained at such insured depository institution if such account is—

“(I) owned or controlled by a gambling business; and

“(II) includes proceeds of, or is used to facilitate a violation of, section 1084; or

“(ii) seize funds in an account described in subparagraph (i) if such funds—

“(I) are owned or controlled by a gambling business; and

“(II) constitute the proceeds of, were derived from, or facilitated, a violation of section 1084.

“(C) The limitation in subparagraph (A) shall not apply if the financial transaction provider is a gambling business within the meaning of section 1081(12), in which case such financial transaction provider shall be subject to the enforcement provisions under subparagraph (A).

“(2) The attorney general (or other appropriate State official) of a State in which a communication in violation of section 1084 allegedly has been or will be initiated or received may institute proceedings under this section to obtain injunctive or declarative relief to prevent or restrain the violation or threatened violation. Upon application of the attorney general (or other appropriate State official) of an affected State under this paragraph, the district court may enter a temporary restraining order, a preliminary injunction, an injunction, or declaratory relief against any person (other than a financial transaction provider) to prevent or restrain a violation or threatened violation of section 1084, in accordance with rule 65 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.

“(3) Notwithstanding paragraphs (1) and (2), for a communication in violation of section 1084 that allegedly has been or will be initiated or received on Indian lands (as that term is defined in section 4 of the Indian Gaming Regulatory Act)—

“(A) the United States shall have the enforcement authority provided under paragraph (1);

“(B) the enforcement authorities specified in an applicable Tribal-State compact negotiated under section 11 of the Indian Gaming Regulatory Act (25 U.S.C. 2710) shall be carried out in accordance with that compact; and

“(C) if there is no applicable Tribal-State compact, an appropriate tribal official may institute proceedings in the same manner as an attorney general of a State.

No provision of this section shall be construed as altering, superseding, or otherwise affecting the application of the Indian Gaming Regulatory Act.

“(4) Notwithstanding paragraph (3), no relief shall be granted under this section against a financial transaction provider except as provided in paragraph (1).

“(c) No damages, penalty, or forfeiture, civil or criminal, shall be found against any person or entity for any act done in compliance with any notice received from a law enforcement agency.

“(d) Relief granted under this section against an interactive computer service (as defined in section 230(f) of the Communications Act of 1934) shall—

“(1) be limited to the removal of, or disabling of access to, an online site violating section 1084, or a hypertext link to an online site violating such section, that resides on a computer server that such service controls or operates; except this limitation shall not apply if the service is violating section 1084 or is in active concert with a person who is violating section 1084 and receives actual notice of the relief;

“(2) be available only after notice to the interactive computer service and an opportunity for the service to appear are provided;

“(3) not impose any obligation on an interactive computer service to monitor its service or to affirmatively seek facts indicating activity violating section 1084;

“(4) specify the interactive computer service to which it applies; and

“(5) specifically identify the location of the on-line site or hypertext link to be removed or access to which is to be disabled.”

SEC. 104. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

In addition to any other sums authorized to be appropriated for this purpose, there are authorized to be appropriated to the Department of Justice for each of fiscal years 2007 through 2010 \$10,000,000 for investigations and prosecutions of violations of section 1084 of title 18, United States Code.

SEC. 105. RULES OF CONSTRUCTION.

(a) Nothing in this Act may be construed to prohibit any activity that is allowed under Public Law 95-515 as amended (15 U.S.C. 3001 et seq.).

(b) Nothing in this Act may be construed to preempt State law prohibiting gambling.

SEC. 106. SENSE OF CONGRESS.

It is the sense of Congress that this Act does not change which activities related to horse racing may or may not be allowed under Federal law. Section 105 is intended to address concerns that this Act could have the effect of changing the existing relationship between the Interstate Horseracing Act (15 U.S.C. 3001 et seq.), and other Federal statutes that were in effect at the time of this Act's consideration; this Act is not intended to change that relationship; and this Act is not intended to resolve any existing disagreements over how to interpret the relationship between the Interstate Horseracing Act and other Federal statutes.

TITLE II—POLICIES AND PROCEDURES REQUIRED TO PREVENT PAYMENTS FOR UNLAWFUL GAMBLING

SEC. 201. POLICIES AND PROCEDURES REQUIRED TO PREVENT PAYMENTS FOR UNLAWFUL GAMBLING.

Chapter 53 of title 31, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new subchapter:

“SUBCHAPTER IV—POLICIES AND PROCEDURES REQUIRED TO PREVENT PAYMENTS FOR UNLAWFUL GAMBLING

“§ 5361. Definitions

“For purposes of this subchapter, the following definitions shall apply:

“(1) CREDIT; CREDITOR; CREDIT CARD; AND CARD ISSUER.—The terms ‘credit’, ‘creditor’, ‘credit card’, and ‘card issuer’ have the same meanings as in section 103 of the Truth in Lending Act.

“(2) DESIGNATED PAYMENT SYSTEM.—The term ‘designated payment system’ means any system utilized by a financial transaction provider that the Secretary and the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, in consultation with the Attorney General, jointly determine, by regulation or order, could be utilized in connection with, or to facilitate, any restricted transaction.

“(3) ELECTRONIC FUND TRANSFER.—The term ‘electronic fund transfer’—

“(A) has the same meaning as in section 903 of the Electronic Fund Transfer Act, except that such term includes transfers that

would otherwise be excluded under section 903(6)(E) of that Act; and

“(B) includes any fund transfer covered by Article 4A of the Uniform Commercial Code, as in effect in any State.

“(4) FINANCIAL INSTITUTION.—The term ‘financial institution’ has the same meaning as in section 903 of the Electronic Fund Transfer Act, except that such term does not include a casino, sports book, or other business at or through which bets or wagers may be placed or received.

“(5) FINANCIAL TRANSACTION PROVIDER.—The term ‘financial transaction provider’ means a creditor, credit card issuer, financial institution, operator of a terminal at which an electronic fund transfer may be initiated, money transmitting business, or international, national, regional, or local payment network utilized to effect a credit transaction, electronic fund transfer, stored value product transaction, or money transmitting service, or a participant in such network, or other participant in a designated payment system.

“(6) INSURED DEPOSITORY INSTITUTION.—The term ‘insured depository institution’—

“(A) has the same meaning as in section 3 of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act; and

“(B) includes an insured credit union (as defined in section 101 of the Federal Credit Union Act).

“(7) MONEY TRANSMITTING BUSINESS AND MONEY TRANSMITTING SERVICE.—The terms ‘money transmitting business’ and ‘money transmitting service’ have the same meanings as in section 5330(d) (determined without regard to any regulations prescribed by the Secretary thereunder).

“(8) RESTRICTED TRANSACTION.—The term ‘restricted transaction’ means any transaction or transmittal involving any credit, funds, instrument, or proceeds described in any paragraph of section 5362 which the recipient is prohibited from accepting under such section.

“(9) SECRETARY.—The term ‘Secretary’ means the Secretary of the Treasury.

“(10) UNLAWFUL GAMBLING.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The term ‘unlawful gambling’ means to place, receive, or otherwise knowingly transmit a bet or wager by any means which involves the use of a communication facility where such bet or wager is unlawful under any applicable Federal or State law in the State or tribal lands in which the bet or wager is initiated, received, or otherwise made.

“(B) EXCLUSION OF CERTAIN AUTHORIZED TRANSACTIONS.—The term ‘unlawful gambling’ does not include any intrastate or intratribal transactions authorized under section 1084(c) of title 18, United States Code.

“(C) INTERMEDIATE ROUTING.—With respect to section 5362, the intermediate routing of electronic data shall not determine the location or locations in which a bet or wager is initiated, received, or otherwise made.

“(11) OTHER TERMS.—The terms ‘bet or wager’, ‘communication facility’, ‘gambling business’, ‘own and control’, ‘person’, ‘State’, and ‘tribal’ have the same meanings as in section 1081 of title 18.

“§ 5362. Prohibition on acceptance of any financial instrument for unlawful gambling

“No person engaged in a gambling business may knowingly accept, in connection with the participation of another person in unlawful gambling—

“(1) credit, or the proceeds of credit, extended to or on behalf of such other person (including credit extended through the use of a credit card);

“(2) an electronic fund transfer, or funds transmitted by or through a money transmitting business, or the proceeds of an electronic fund transfer or money transmitting

service, from or on behalf of such other person;

“(3) any check, draft, or similar instrument which is drawn by or on behalf of such other person and is drawn on or payable at or through any financial institution; or

“(4) the proceeds of any other form of financial transaction, as the Secretary and the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System may jointly prescribe by regulation, which involves a financial institution as a payor or financial intermediary on behalf of or for the benefit of such other person.

“§ 5363. Policies and procedures to identify and prevent restricted transactions

“(a) REGULATIONS.—Before the end of the 270-day period beginning on the date of the enactment of this subchapter, the Secretary and the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, in consultation with the Attorney General, shall prescribe regulations (which the Secretary and the Board jointly determine to be appropriate) requiring each designated payment system, and all participants therein, to identify and block or otherwise prevent or prohibit restricted transactions through the establishment of policies and procedures reasonably designed to identify and block or otherwise prevent or prohibit the acceptance of restricted transactions in any of the following ways:

“(1) The establishment of policies and procedures that—

“(A) allow the payment system and any person involved in the payment system to identify restricted transactions by means of codes in authorization messages or by other means; and

“(B) block restricted transactions identified as a result of the policies and procedures developed pursuant to subparagraph (A).

“(2) The establishment of policies and procedures that prevent or prohibit the acceptance of the products or services of the payment system in connection with a restricted transaction.

“(b) REQUIREMENTS FOR POLICIES AND PROCEDURES.—In prescribing regulations under subsection (a), the Secretary and the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System shall—

“(1) identify types of policies and procedures, including nonexclusive examples, which would be deemed, as applicable, to be reasonably designed to identify and block or otherwise prevent or prohibit the acceptance of the products or services with respect to each type of restricted transaction;

“(2) to the extent practical, permit any participant in a payment system to choose among alternative means of identifying and blocking, or otherwise preventing or prohibiting the acceptance of the products or services of the payment system or participant in connection with, restricted transactions; and

“(3) consider exempting certain restricted transactions or designated, payment systems from any requirement imposed under such regulations, if the Secretary and the Board jointly find that it is not reasonably practical to identify and block, or otherwise prevent or prohibit the acceptance of, such transactions.

“(c) COMPLIANCE WITH PAYMENT SYSTEM POLICIES AND PROCEDURES.—A financial transaction provider shall be considered to be in compliance with the regulations prescribed under subsection (a), if—

“(1) such person relies on and complies with the policies and procedures of a designated payment system of which it is a member or participant to—

“(A) identify and block restricted transactions; or

“(B) otherwise prevent or prohibit the acceptance of the products or services of the

payment system, member, or participant in connection with restricted transactions; and

“(2) such policies and procedures of the designated payment system comply with the requirements of regulations prescribed under subsection (a).

“(d) NO LIABILITY FOR BLOCKING OR REFUSING TO HONOR RESTRICTED TRANSACTIONS.—A person that identifies and blocks a transaction, prevents or prohibits the acceptance of its products or services in connection with a transaction, or otherwise refuses to honor a transaction—

“(1) that is a restricted transaction;

“(2) that such person reasonably believes to be a restricted transaction; or

“(3) as a designated payment system or a member of a designated payment system in reliance on the policies and procedures of the payment system, in an effort to comply with regulations prescribed under subsection (a), shall not be liable to any party for such action.

“(e) REGULATORY ENFORCEMENT.—The requirements of this subchapter shall be enforced exclusively by—

“(1) the Federal functional regulators, with respect to the designated payment systems and financial transaction providers subject to the respective jurisdiction of such regulators under section 505(a) of the Gramm-Leach-Bliley Act and section 5g of the Commodities Exchange Act; and

“(2) the Federal Trade Commission, with respect to designated payment systems and financial transaction providers not otherwise subject to the jurisdiction of any Federal functional regulators (including the Commission) as described in paragraph (1).”.

SEC. 202. TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENT.

The table of sections for chapter 53 of title 31, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“SUBCHAPTER IV—POLICIES AND PROCEDURES REQUIRED TO PREVENT PAYMENTS FOR UNLAWFUL GAMBLING

“5361. Definitions.

“5362. Prohibition on acceptance of any financial instrument for unlawful gambling.

“5363. Policies and procedures to identify and prevent restricted transactions.”.

TITLE III—INTERNET GAMBLING IN OR THROUGH FOREIGN JURISDICTIONS

SEC. 301. INTERNET GAMBLING IN OR THROUGH FOREIGN JURISDICTIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—In deliberations between the United States Government and any other country on money laundering, corruption, and crime issues, the United States Government should—

(1) encourage cooperation by foreign governments and relevant international fora in identifying whether Internet gambling operations are being used for money laundering, corruption, or other crimes;

(2) advance policies that promote the cooperation of foreign governments, through information sharing or other measures, in the enforcement of this Act; and

(3) encourage the Financial Action Task Force on Money Laundering, in its annual report on money laundering typologies, to study the extent to which Internet gambling operations are being used for money laundering purposes.

(b) REPORT REQUIRED.—The Secretary of the Treasury shall submit an annual report to the Congress on any deliberations between the United States and other countries on issues relating to Internet gambling.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. After 1 hour of debate on the bill, as amended,

it shall be in order to consider the further amendment printed in House Report 109-551, if offered by the gentleman from Nevada (Ms. BERKLEY) or her designee, which shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question, shall be considered read, and shall be debatable for 20 minutes, equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent.

The gentleman from Ohio (Mr. OXLEY), the gentlewoman from Oregon (Ms. HOOLEY), the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER), and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS) each will control 15 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. OXLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 4411, the Internet Gambling Prohibition and Enforcement Act. This bill represents the combined efforts of my esteemed colleagues, Chairmen BOB GOODLATTE and JIM LEACH, who have crafted an effective piece of legislation to finally stop the illegal Internet gambling we have worked against for so many years.

The Goodlatte-Leach bill combines two complementary approaches. First, it cuts off the flow of money to Internet gambling Web sites. These Web sites, almost always located on some far-flung Caribbean island, will no longer be allowed to accept bettors' credit cards, fund transfers, or checks drawn on American banks.

Secondly, H.R. 4411 clarifies that the 45-year-old Wire Act covers illegal Internet gambling. As a former FBI agent, I can attest to the fact that the Wire Act is an effective tool in stopping crime, and this bill will help us make better use of it.

Illegal Internet gambling is bad for a number of important reasons. Experts at the FBI and Justice Department have warned that these sites are often fronts for money laundering, drug trafficking and terrorist financing. Internet gambling sites evade U.S.-based regulations that ensure the integrity of casino games, prevent minors from gambling, and puts in safeguards for problem gamblers.

Because these businesses are located overseas, they provide no tax revenues, provide no U.S. jobs, all the while evading Federal and State law enforcement. Unlike legal gambling here in the United States, no enforcement mechanism exists to ensure that individuals are protected against these overseas Internet gambling sites. And with no age verification, savvy online gambling sites are preying on minors and young adults.

This Internet gambling bill is a culmination of a decade of hard work by Chairmen GOODLATTE and LEACH. I would also like to commend the efforts of Mr. BACHUS, Mr. WOLF, Mr. PITTS, Ms. HOOLEY, and Mrs. KELLY, just to name a few. With their help, we have passed several versions of this legislation in the House. I remain hopeful

that the Senate will be able to do the same and we can once and for all give the banking regulators and the Justice Department the tools they need to stop illegal Internet gambling.

□ 1215

In the meantime, I strongly urge my colleagues to support the Goodlatte-Leach bill.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. HOOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 4411, the Internet Gambling Prohibition Act.

I would like to thank Mr. LEACH and Mr. GOODLATTE for their hard work on bringing this bill to the House floor. It certainly has not been an easy task.

I would like to thank Mr. FRANK, our ranking member on the Financial Services Committee, for the opportunity to manage this debate. Even though he and I do not see eye to eye on this legislation, I appreciate and respect the fact that we have agreed to disagree, and I welcome a healthy debate on enforcement of the illegal Internet gambling laws.

Internet gambling is a growing problem in the United States, particularly among young people and college students. It is known to destroy families, marriages and entire lives. As so aptly put by University of Illinois Professor John Kindt, "You just click the mouse and lose your house."

This legislation makes clear that we are serious about enforcing our Internet gambling laws that are already on the books. It takes a very important step forward, and we have worked very hard on the Financial Services Committee over the last few Congresses to advance this measure.

This bill cuts off the flow of money to Internet gambling Web sites by regulating payment systems. The Department of Treasury and the Federal Reserve will jointly develop policies and procedures for identifying and preventing financial transactions related to illegal Internet gambling. Payment systems will be required to comply with these regulations.

Even when criminal law cannot be enforced, the Federal Government's jurisdiction over financial systems can nevertheless cut off the money sources for these illegal businesses.

I believe we should mean what we say when it comes to Internet gambling. If we are to keep laws on the books that prohibit Internet gambling, then we should take steps to enforce it. And by cutting off the flow of money, we can accomplish just that.

As was previously noted, this bill is supported by 48 of the 50 State attorneys general, by the NCAA, the NBA, the NFL, the MLB and the NHL. It is a good bill and a commonsense approach to a growing problem. I urge my colleagues to end the flow of money to illegal Internet gambling Web sites, and I urge passage of this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman from Iowa may control the time of the gentleman from Ohio.

There was no objection.

Mr. LEACH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 3¼ minutes.

Mr. Speaker, for nearly a decade, many in the Congress have sought to deter Internet gambling. But time and again the issue has been stymied, often in ways that reflect imperfectly on this institution. But it cannot be stressed enough that from a macroeconomic perspective, there are no social benefits for Internet gambling, and from a microfamily perspective, enormous harm is frequently inflicted.

John Kindt, a professor of business at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign calls the Internet "crack cocaine for gamblers. There are no needle marks," he says. "There is no alcohol on the breath. You just click the mouse and lose your house."

These comments could not be more apropos than for Greg Hogan, Jr., a 19-year old Lehigh University class president and chaplain's assistant from Barberton, Ohio. This pastor's son gambled away \$7,500 playing online Texas Hold-'Em, then confessed to robbing a bank to try to recover his losses. His life is ruined.

Never before has it been so easy to lose so much money, so quickly, at such a young age. Internet casinos are proliferating. Soon they will be ubiquitous.

In the next 5 years, if Congress does not act to clarify and enforce the laws banning Internet gambling, and if Internet casinos' business plans come to pass, gamblers will be able to place bets not just from their home computers but also from their cell phones, while they drive from work, or from their BlackBerry's as they wait in line at the movies.

Mr. Speaker, the time has come for Congress to finally deal with the subject matter. The measure before us, H.R. 4411, is supported by the NCAA, all the major professional sports organizations, from the NFL and Major League Baseball to the NBA and NHL, as well as the financial services industry, family groups, religious organizations and 48 of the 50 State attorneys general.

The reason the sports groups support the legislation, as our colleague, TOM OSBORNE, so thoughtfully noted, is that they are concerned with the integrity of the games.

The reason the religious community has come together is that they are concerned for the unity of the American family. Internet gambling is not a subject touched upon in the Old or New Testament or the Koran or the Bhagavad Gita. But the pastoral function is one of dealing with families in difficulty. And religious leaders of all denominations and faiths are seeing gambling difficulties erode family values.

It will be suggested in this debate that there is no call to rein in activities of individual choice. But it should be clear that in the history of the Western world, whenever gambling has been legalized it has been subject to careful regulation. This is simply not the case with the Internet. Nor is it the case that an individual's misjudgment does not affect society as a whole.

There is nothing in Internet gambling that adds to the GDP or makes America more competitive in the world. Indeed, if an individual cannot repay his or her debt, neighbors will be subject to higher interest rates. Everyone loses if this industry continues its remarkable growth.

While Congress has failed to act, the illegal Internet gambling industry has boomed. This year, Americans are projected to send more than \$6 billion to unregulated, offshore, online casinos, half of the \$12 billion that will be bet worldwide on Internet gambling. FBI and Justice Department experts have warned that Internet gambling sites are vulnerable to be used for money laundering, drug trafficking and even terrorist financing. Further, these sites evade rigorous U.S.-based regulations that control gambling by minors and problem gamblers, and ensure the integrity of the games.

Internet gambling's characteristics are unique: online players can gamble 24 hours a day from home; children may play without sufficient age verification; and betting with a credit card can undercut a player's perception of the value of cash, leading to addiction, bankruptcy and crime. Unlike in brick-and-mortar casinos in the United States where legal protections for bettors exist and where there is some compensatory social benefit in jobs and tax revenues, Internet gambling sites principally yield only liabilities to America and to Americans.

H.R. 4411 was introduced to provide federal and state governments strong tools to enforce existing gambling prohibitions. It would crack down on illegal gambling by clarifying that the Wire Act covers all forms of interstate gambling and would account for new technologies. Designed to cut the money flow from gamblers to Internet gambling sites, the bill would enhance criminal penalties for gambling businesses settling Internet wagers with financial instruments such as credit cards, checks, or fund transfers. It would also require payment systems to establish procedures for blocking these transactions.

Internet gambling has become as much a part of the college experience as late-night study sessions and rooting for the football team. Researchers have called gambling online addictive. Players attest to becoming obsessed with it. The activity is illegal, but the law is not being forced.

According to a study by the Annenberg Public Policy Center, nearly 10 percent of college students gambled online last year. They play in their dorm rooms, in library lounges, in class. The number of college males who reported gambling online once a week or more quadrupled in the last year alone.

Finally, a note about horseracing. In 1978, Congress passed the Interstate Horseracing Act (IHA) to set forth the rights and responsibilities applicable to interstate wagering on horseracing, to affirm that States have primary

responsibility for regulating gambling within their borders, and to prevent States from interfering with the gambling policies of other States. In 2000, Congress amended the IHA to clarify that the statute applied to the transmission of interstate off-track wagers via telephone or other electronic media.

The Executive Branch has taken the position that the 1961 Wire Act overrides the IHA, even though the IHA is a more recent statute, because neither statute expressly exempts IHA transactions from the Wire Act. The horseracing industry vigorously disagrees. H.R. 4411 has been very carefully drafted to maintain the status quo regarding horseracing, preserving the ability of the Executive Branch and the horseracing industry to litigate the proper interpretation of these two statutes. The text of the bill is clear: "this Act does not change which activates related to horseracing may or may not be allowed under Federal law." To the degree this act provides new definitional standards, it bolsters rather than diminishes the Justice Department's latitude.

Bills of this nature are always controversial and subject to intense lobbying by powerful interests. I believe the approach on the table represents the only credible initiative likely to be considered in the foreseeable future. I urge support for this important legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. HOOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK), the ranking member on the Financial Services Committee.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I strongly disagree with the gentleman from Iowa with whom I often agree. I don't disagree with him entirely. I will stipulate that there is nothing in the Bagavagida about gambling. But other than that, I don't think he got much right.

He says that gambling on the Internet does not add to the GDP or make America competitive. Has it become the role of this Congress to prohibit any activity that an adult wants to engage in voluntarily if it doesn't add to the GDP or make us more competitive?

What kind of social, cultural authoritarianism are we advocating here?

Now, I agree there is a practice around today that causes a lot of problems, damages families, people lose their jobs, they get in debt. They do it to excess. It is called drinking. Are we going to go back to Prohibition? Prohibition didn't work for alcohol; it doesn't work for gambling.

When people abuse a particular practice, the sensible thing is to try to deal with the abuse, not outlaw it.

By the way, this bill allows certain kinds of Internet gambling to stay, so apparently the notion is that those few people who are obsessive and addicted will not take advantage of those forms which are still available to them.

But the fundamental point is this. If an adult in this country, with his or her own money, wants to engage in an activity that harms no one, how dare we prohibit it because it doesn't add to the GDP or it has no macroeconomic

benefit. Are we all to take home calculators and, until we have satisfied the gentleman from Iowa that we are being socially useful, we abstain from recreational activities that we choose?

This Congress is well on the way to getting it absolutely backwards. In areas where we need to act together to protect the quality of our life, in the environment, in transportation, in public safety, we abstain; but in those areas where individuals ought to be allowed to make their own choices, we intervene. And that is what this is.

Now, people have said, well, some students abuse it. We should work to try to diminish abuse. But if we were to outlaw for adults everything that college students abuse, we would all just sit home and do nothing.

By the way, credit card abuse among students is a more serious problem, I believe, than gambling. Maybe gambling will catch up. But we have heard many, many stories about young people who have credit cards that they abuse. Do we ban credit cards for them?

But here is the fundamental issue. Shouldn't it be the principle in this government that the burden of proof is on those who want to prohibit adults from their own free choices to show that they are harming other people?

We ought to say that, if you decide with your own money to engage in an activity that harms no one else, you ought to be allowed to do it. And once you say, oh, no, but that doesn't add to the GDP, and that can lead to some problems in families, then this is hardly the only thing you will end up banning.

The fundamental principle of the autonomy of the individual is at stake today.

Now, I have to say, I understand a lot of the conservatives don't like it because there are people on the religious side who don't like it. Some of my liberal friends, I think, are being very inconsistent. We are for allowing a lot of things. I mean, many of us vote to say, You can burn the flag; I wish you wouldn't, but you can. It shouldn't be a crime.

You can look at certain things on television that maybe other people think you shouldn't. You can do other things but you can't gamble. There is a fundamental inconsistency there.

I guess people think gambling is tacky. They don't like it. Well, fine, then don't do it. But don't prohibit other individuals from engaging in it.

People have said, What is the value of gambling? Here is the value. Some human beings enjoy doing it. Shouldn't that be our principle? If individuals like doing something and they harm no one, we will allow them to do it, even if other people disapprove of what they do.

And it is, of course, likely to be ineffective. The best thing that ever happens to illegal gamblers is when you do a measure like this.

I hope the bill is defeated.

Mr. LEACH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. ADERHOLT).

Mr. ADERHOLT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 4411, which is the Internet Gambling Prohibition and Enforcement Act. Gambling in any form, especially Internet gambling, is especially dangerous to children. Because these illegal Web sites lack reliable age verification tools, children of any age can access the sites and begin gambling.

For adults, these sites encourage gambling addiction with their ease of access, especially with regard to how easy it is to use credit cards.

I would like to be clear for the record, Mr. Speaker. I oppose the expansion of gambling in all forms. I have been a long-time opponent of gambling. I have cosponsored tough enforcement measures in the past, including increased criminal penalties and support for international anti-money-laundering efforts.

Today's bill includes those measures and takes a strong step to curtail those dangerous sites by cutting off their source of funding. It is an important step toward eradicating this threat and ensuring the safety of our children and our communities.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, let me just say, I encourage my colleagues to support this legislation and to vote against the amendment that would be brought up today that would actually gut the results of this legislation.

Ms. HOOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PAUL).

(Mr. PAUL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this legislation. It is not easy to oppose this legislation because it is assumed that proponents of the bill are on the side of the moral high ground. But there is a higher moral high ground in the sense that protecting liberty is more important than passing a bill that regulates something on the Internet.

The Interstate Commerce Clause originally was intended to make sure there were no barriers between interstate trade. In this case, we are putting barriers up.

I want to make the point that prohibition, as a general principle, is a bad principle because it doesn't work. It doesn't solve the problem because it can't decrease the demand. As a matter of fact, the only thing it does is increase the price. And there are some people who see prohibitions as an enticement, and that it actually increases the demand.

But once you make something illegal, whether it is alcohol or whether it is cigarettes or whether it is gambling on the Internet, it doesn't disappear because of this increased demand. All that happens is, it is turned over to the criminal element. So you won't get rid of it.

Sometimes people say that this prohibition that is proposed is designed to protect other interests because we certainly aren't going to get rid of gambling, so we might get rid of one type of gambling, but actually enhance the other.

But one of the basic principles, a basic reason why I strongly oppose this is, I see this as a regulation of the Internet, which is a very, very dangerous precedent to set.

To start with, I can see some things that are much more dangerous than gambling. I happen to personally strongly oppose gambling. I think it is pretty stupid, to tell you the truth.

But what about political ideas? What about religious fanaticism? Are we going to get rid of those? I can think of 1,000 things worse coming from those bad ideas. But who will come down here and say, Just think of the evil of these bad ideas and distorted religions, and therefore we have to regulate the Internet?

H.R. 4411, the Internet Gambling Prohibition and Enforcement Act, should be rejected by Congress since the Federal Government has no constitutional authority to ban or even discourage any form of gambling.

In addition to being unconstitutional, H.R. 4411 is likely to prove ineffective at ending Internet gambling. Instead, this bill will ensure that gambling is controlled by organized crime. History, from the failed experiment of prohibition to today's futile "war on drugs," shows that the government cannot eliminate demand for something like Internet gambling simply by passing a law. Instead, H.R. 4411 will force those who wish to gamble over the Internet to patronize suppliers willing to flaunt the ban. In many cases, providers of services banned by the government will be members of criminal organizations. Even if organized crime does not operate Internet gambling enterprises their competitors are likely to be controlled by organized crime. After all, since the owners and patrons of Internet gambling cannot rely on the police and courts to enforce contracts and resolve other disputes, they will be forced to rely on members of organized crime to perform those functions. Thus, the profits of Internet gambling will flow into organized crime. Furthermore, outlawing an activity will raise the price vendors are able to charge consumers, thus increasing the profits flowing to organized crime from Internet gambling. It is bitterly ironic that a bill masquerading as an attack on crime will actually increase organized crime's ability to control and profit from Internet gambling.

In conclusion, H.R. 4411 violates the constitutional limits on Federal power. Furthermore, laws such as H.R. 4411 are ineffective in eliminating the demand for vices such as Internet gambling; instead, they ensure that these enterprises will be controlled by organized crime. Therefore I urge my colleagues to reject H.R. 4411, the Internet Gambling Prohibition and Enforcement Act.

Mr. LEACH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to a great leader of this particular effort, Mr. BACHUS from Alabama.

□ 1230

Mr. BACHUS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman, and I would like to re-

spond to the gentleman from Texas and the gentleman from Massachusetts and tell you why we need this bill and we need it desperately.

We have been trying to move this legislation for 5 years, and in the 5 years that we have failed to move it, as many as half a million young teenagers have become compulsive gamblers. Now, the Harvard Medical School, the University of South Florida, and the American Psychiatric Association have all told us that the younger someone is exposed to gambling, the younger they start gambling, the more addictive it becomes. In fact, about three times more addictive.

The University of Connecticut did a recent study, and I am going to introduce it for the RECORD, that says Internet gambling is three times as likely to produce a problem gambler. Seventy-four percent of the young people that they surveyed who said they had gambled on the Internet developed a serious addiction.

Now, what happens when they gamble and they get an addiction? McGill University did a study, and they said that teenagers who gamble on the Internet show increased criminal activity, strained family relationships, and depression. Thirty percent of those who became addicted to gambling on the Internet actually attempted suicide. That is why Mr. LEACH talked about the young man who was the class sophomore president at Lehigh University who actually robbed a bank. A 17-year-old who lost a \$6,000 bet on the Internet committed suicide. We have got to move against this.

Finally, let me conclude with this: let me tell you what has happened in the past year. According to the University of Pennsylvania, in the last year we have gotten another 150,000 young compulsive gamblers.

It is already illegal. What we are doing is stopping it. You have got the criminals on one side, and you have got young people on the other side; and we must protect the young people from these criminals.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 4411, the Goodlatte-Leach Internet Gambling Prohibition and Enforcement Act.

I want to begin by thanking Chairmen OXLEY and Sensenbrenner and Congressmen GOODLATTE and LEACH for bringing H.R. 4411 to the Floor today and for their undying determination to put an end to Internet gambling in the United States. H.R. 4411 would help stop the growing threat that Internet gambling poses to the most vulnerable in our society, kids and problem gamblers.

H.R. 4411 provides strong new enforcement mechanisms to stop the offshore casinos that flagrantly violate existing state and federal laws against Internet gambling. This bill enables our financial regulators to prescribe regulations limiting the acceptance of financial instruments for unlawful Internet gambling. In addition, H.R. 4411 amends the Wire Act of 1961 to expressly prohibit illegal online interstate gambling. H.R. 4411 was reported by both the Financial Services and Judiciary Committees. Similar legislation has passed the

House in the previous two Congresses. Now is the time to cut off illegal Internet gambling once and for all.

We have been discussing this issue for years. It has taken way too long. In the time we've been debating this issue, Internet gambling sites have virtually overrun the Internet. Five years ago, there were less than 50 Internet gambling sites. Today, there are more than two thousand sites that will generate upwards of \$5.9 billion this year alone, nearly half of the \$12 billion bet worldwide on Internet gambling.

Support for our efforts to stop the money flow to illegal gambling sites have been nearly universal, from family and religious groups to anti-gambling groups, from professional sports to college athletics, from major players in the banking and credit card industries to law enforcement and Internet service providers. Mr. Speaker, it is far easier and far quicker to just list who doesn't support our efforts. That would, of course, be the illegal gambling industry itself. They have launched an all-out effort at obfuscation and mischaracterization in hopes of defeating this bill and perpetuating their noxious activities.

The ability of the Internet to penetrate every home and community has both positive and negative consequences. It can be a valuable source of information and a way to communicate quickly with loved ones. But, the Internet can also override community values and standards. Gambling is an excellent example of this. Gambling is currently illegal in the United States unless it is regulated by the states. With the Internet, however, prohibitions against gambling and regulations governing gambling are turned on their head.

The negative effects of gambling have been widely documented. All too often, gambling results in addiction, bankruptcy, divorce, crime and moral decline. Internet gambling magnifies the destructiveness of gambling by bringing the casino into your home. According to an extensive survey done by the University of Connecticut Health Center, 74 percent of those who have used the Internet to gamble have serious problems with addiction, and many of those have resorted to criminal activities to pay for the habit. We heard testimony at one of our hearings that Internet gambling is proving to be a serious problem for many college students. One student reportedly lost \$10,000 on Internet sports gambling over a three-month period.

Imagine if you found out that a casino was being built next door to your house, and that they had invited your children to participate in gambling activities. You would probably think that was unacceptable. But Internet gambling Web sites are actually worse than that. Sitting right on the computer desk in your home or in your child's bedroom is a computer with easy access to more than 2,000 Web sites that offer illegal Internet gambling services.

Worse yet, your kids could use your credit card to gamble on the Internet and run you into bankruptcy—without you even knowing it.

In addition, Internet gambling has been linked to terrorists and organized crime. The FBI and the Department of Justice have testified that Internet gambling serves as a vehicle for money laundering that can be exploited by terrorists. These Internet sites—most of which are operated offshore—represent a serious money laundering vulnerability for our country.

So what would H.R. 4411 do?

H.R. 4411 addresses the problem of Internet gambling in four ways:

First, it clarifies that the Wire Act covers all forms of gambling including Internet gambling and increases the maximum penalty for violations of the Wire Act from two to five years in prison.

Second, and most importantly, it cuts off the flow of money to Internet gambling Web sites by regulating the payments system.

The legislation directs the Treasury Department and the Federal Reserve to jointly develop regulations preventing financial transactions related to illegal Internet gambling.

Third, the legislation authorizes State and Federal law enforcement to seek injunctions against persons who facilitate illegal Internet gambling; and

Fourth, the U.S. government through the Treasury Department is exhorted to advance international cooperation in law enforcement efforts against illegal gambling and related money laundering.

Internet gambling is already illegal under Federal and State law, but most of the more than two thousand Internet gambling sites operate from offshore locations. Currently, these "virtual casinos" advertise the ease of opening betting accounts mainly through the use of credit cards. Therefore, they operate beyond the reach of our law. The regulations and anti-money laundering laws that apply to casinos in our country do not apply to these fly-by-night offshore Internet operators. Shutting off the money source is the only way to shut down these illegal Internet gambling Web sites.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, let me just say that a vote for this bill is a vote against illegal Internet gambling. This bill shuts off the money. That is what these people are waiting for, the money. If we shut off the money, we shut off the sites.

My thanks again go to Chairman OXLEY, Chairman SENSENBRENNER, Congressman GOODLATTE and Congressman LEACH for their tireless efforts in moving this bill forward and bringing it to the floor today. I urge all of my colleagues to vote in favor of this legislation.

DISORDERED GAMBLING AMONG UNIVERSITY-BASED MEDICAL AND DENTAL PATIENTS: A FOCUS ON INTERNET GAMBLING

George T. Ladd and Nancy M. Petry—
University of Connecticut Health Center.

The authors evaluated gambling behaviors, including Internet gambling, among patients seeking free or reduced-cost dental or health care. Three hundred eighty-nine patients at university health clinics completed a questionnaire that included the South Oaks Gambling Screen (SOGS; H. R. Lesieur & S. Blume, 1987). All respondents had gambled in their lifetimes, with 70% gambling in the past 2 months. On the basis of SOGS scores, 10.6% were problem gamblers, and 15.4% were pathological gamblers. The most common forms of gambling were lottery, slot machines, and scratch tickets. Internet gambling was reported by 8.1% of participants. Compared to non-Internet gamblers, Internet gamblers were more likely to be younger, non-Caucasian, and have higher SOGS scores. This study is among the first to evaluate the prevalence of Internet gambling and suggests that people who gamble on the Internet are likely to have a gambling problem. Results also illuminate the need to screen patients seeking health care services for gambling problems.

The fourth edition of the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders

(American Psychiatric Association, 1994) describes pathological gambling as a disorder that involves preoccupation with, tolerance of, and loss of control relating to gambling behaviors. A recent meta-analysis of prevalence rates (Shaffer, Hall, & VanderBilt, 1999) concluded that approximately 1.6% of North American adults may be Level 3 (pathological) gamblers. An additional 3.9% may be Level 2 (problematic) gamblers, bringing the combined percentage of disordered gamblers to more than 5%.

Although prevalence rates in general populations have been described (Shaffer et al. 1999), there is a paucity of studies that have focused on the prevalence of gambling among primary-care patients (Miller, 1996b; Pasternak & Fleming, 1999; Van Es, 2000). As a consequence, health care professionals may not be aware of the impact that gambling behaviors can have on the health of their patients. Health comorbidities found to be associated with pathological gambling include substance abuse, circulatory disease, gastrointestinal distress, sexual dysfunction, anxiety disorders, and depression (Bergh & Kuhlhorn, 1994; Daghestani, 1987b; Lesieur, Blume, & Zoppa, 1986; Miller, 1996a; Pasternak & Fleming, 1999).

This study presents two central opportunities for contribution to the existing body of knowledge about disordered gambling. First, we directed our attention toward gambling behaviors among a subset of the population that seeks free or reduced-cost health care. A second focus of this study was the types of gambling activities in which people engage, with special attention paid to Internet gambling. Many researchers have examined the prevalence of disordered gambling (e.g., Shaffer et al., 1999), but few have presented data on the types of gambling in which individuals participate, and no known published studies have focused on the prevalence of Internet gambling.

METHOD

Participants for this study were drawn from patients seeking treatment at the University of Connecticut Health Center (UCHC) each year. Of the 389 patients included in this study, 76.5% were from UCHC dental clinics, which serve primarily uninsured patients. The remaining 22.5% of participants were from other UCHC medical clinics. The UCHC is located 8 miles southeast of Hartford, Connecticut, and is approximately 65 miles from two large casinos.

Procedures

Questionnaires were left in the waiting areas of various UCHC health and dental clinics for 13 months (8/1/99–9/2/00) along with collection boxes. Approximately 2,000 patients were treated in these clinics during the study period. Signs encouraging questionnaire completion were displayed in these general areas. On occasion, a research assistant would approach patients within clinics and ask them to complete a screen. No patients who were verbally asked to complete a questionnaire refused. Nonresponses were probably a result of failure to notice the signs and questionnaires rather than refusal to participate. An overall average return rate of 85.7% across the UCHC clinics was determined on weeks in which the numbers of screens left out and collected were monitored.

Measures

The 2-page questionnaire consisted of the South Oaks Gambling Screen (SOGS; Lesieur & Blume, 1987) as well as questions regarding demographic information and gambling activities.

Data analysis

We used the SOGS (Lesieur & Blume, 1987) component of the questionnaires to classify

participants as Level 1 (score of 0–2), Level 2 (score of 3–4), or Level 3 (score >5) gamblers (Lesieur & Heineman, 1988; Shaffer et al., 1999).

We present here the types of participants' gambling activities, along with the frequency and intensity of recent gambling behaviors (past year, past 2 months, and past week) by level of disordered gambling. We compared participants who reported experience with Internet gambling and participants who reported no experience with Internet gambling on demographic variables and SOGS scores. We evaluated differences among the three levels of gamblers, as well as between Internet versus non-Internet gamblers, using the chi-square test for categorical data, analysis of variance for continuous data, and Kruskal-Wallis tests for non-normally distributed continuous data.

RESULTS

Response rates and demographic characteristics of the respondent sample

In total, 402 questionnaires were filled out. Thirteen respondents left many SOGS items unanswered and were thus excluded, leaving 389 questionnaires for further analysis.

Continuum of SOGS scores

Of the respondents, 46.8% scored a 0 on the SOGS, indicative of no problematic gambling behaviors. Additional segments of respondents scored 1 (17.0%) and 2 (10.3%) on the SOGS. Therefore, according to the classification system described by Shaffer et al. (1999), 74.0% of respondents qualified as Level 1 gamblers, and 10.6% of the respondents were classified as Level 2 gamblers, with 6.2% scoring a 3 and 4.4% scoring a 4. The final 15.4% of respondents were classified as Level 3 gamblers, with 6.9% scoring between 5 and 9, 5.7% scoring between 10 and 14, and 2.8% scoring between 15 and 20.

Demographic characteristics

Although no statistically significant group differences were found with regard to gender, the three groups of gamblers differed on other demographic characteristics. Specifically, differences among the groups emerged with respect to age, $F(2, 382) = 8.58, p < .01$; ethnicity, $X^2(6, N = 374) = 23.01, p < .001$; marital status, $X^2(8, N = 384) = 18.80, p < .001$; education, $X^2(8, N = 376) = 34.45, p < .001$; and yearly income, $X^2(6, N = 374) = 12.89, p < .05$. Compared to Level 1 gamblers, Level 2 and 3 gamblers were more likely to be younger, of non-Caucasian ethnicity, not married, and have lower levels of education and income.

Gambling participation

All of the respondents reported having gambled in their lifetimes, with 90.0% having gambled within the past year, 70.0% within the past 2 months, and 42.0% within the past week. The most common form of gambling was the lottery, with 89.2% of the total sample having lifetime experience with the lottery. Twenty-five percent of the sample reported weekly or more frequent lottery playing. Slot machines were the next most popular gambling activity, with 81.7% of the sample having lifetime experience, and 6.7% playing slots at least weekly. Scratch tickets were played by 78.7%, with 19.0% of participants playing at least weekly. Card-playing forms of gambling were reported by 70.8%, with 8.7% of participants playing at least weekly. More than half of the participants reported lifetime participation in sports betting (56.9%), bingo (56.0%), and animal betting (52.7%). Lifetime participation in other gambling activities, such as games of skill (40.8%), roulette (37.1%), dice (33.8%), high-risk stocks (23.6%), and video lottery (21.7%) were each reported by only a minority of the total sample.

Internet gambling

Of note is that 8.1% ($n = 31$) of participants reported Internet gambling in their lifetimes, including 3.7% ($n = 14$) who reported gambling on the Internet at least weekly. Demographic and other characteristics of Internet gamblers compared to non-Internet gamblers are shown in Table 1. Age, $F(1, 378) = 17.68, p < .01$, and ethnicity, $X^2(3, N = 376) = 17.80, p < .001$, were found to differ significantly among participants who reported Internet gambling compared to those who did not. Younger participants were more likely than older participants to have Internet gambling experience. Although non-Caucasian participants represented 15.8% of the total participants, they represented 35.8% of those participants who had experience with Internet gambling.

The comparison of participants with or without Internet gambling experience revealed significant differences in both SOGS scores, $F(1, 382) = 40.79, p < .01$, and classified gambling levels, $X^2(2, N = 389) = 63.23, p < .001$. Only 22% of participants without any Internet gambling experience were Level 2 or 3 gamblers. In contrast, 74% of participants with Internet gambling experience were classified as Level 2 or 3 gamblers.

DISCUSSION

We examined gambling participation and problems of 389 patients who completed questionnaires at the UCHC medical and dental clinics. When the lifetime rates of 10.6% for Level 2 and 15.4% for Level 3 gamblers are combined, the resulting 26.0% rate of disordered gambling (Levels 2 and 3) in this study far exceeds the 6.7% derived from general population surveys conducted since 1993 (National Gambling Impact Study Commission, 1999; Shaffer et al., 1999).

TABLE 1.—DEMOGRAPHIC AND SOUTH OAKS GAMBLING SCREEN (SOGS) SCORING CHARACTERISTICS

Variable	Without internet gambling experience	With internet gambling experience	Total sample
N	351	31	389
Gender (female)	56.7	41.9	54.4
Age (M/SD)	43.5/15.8	31.7/13.6	42.8/16.0
Education level:			
No high school diploma	9.3	20.0	9.8
High school diploma	27.0	36.0	27.9
Some college	23.8	8.0	22.6
College diploma	21.5	20.0	21.3
Postcollege	18.3	16.0	18.4
Ethnicity ^a :			
African American	7.7	12.9	8.3
Caucasian	86.3	61.3	84.2
Hispanic	5.4	22.6	6.7
Other	0.6	0.3	0.8
Marital status:			
Divorced or separated	15.0	19.4	15.1
Living w/partner	10.4	16.1	10.7
Married or remarried	46.7	29.0	45.6
Single	23.6	29.0	24.0
Widowed	4.3	6.5	4.7
Income:			
Under \$10K	13.7	22.6	14.4
\$10–25K	21.7	22.6	21.4
\$25,001–50K	24.7	22.6	24.9
Above \$50K	39.9	32.2	39.3
SOGS score (M/SD) ^a	1.8/3.4	7.8/2.0	2.26/4.01
SOGS level ^a :			
Level 1	78.3	25.8	74.0
Level 2	10.5	9.7	10.6
Level 3	11.1	64.5	15.4

Note. All values are percentages unless otherwise indicated.

^a Groups differ, $p < .001$.

The higher rates of Level 2 and 3 gamblers found in this study may be due to a response bias. Individuals who liked to gamble or who had a problem with gambling may have been more likely to complete the questionnaire. However, considering that 74.0% of the participants were classified as nonproblematic gamblers and that 58.2% scored 0 on the SOGS, the majority of participants who completed the questionnaires had no apparent gambling problems. Another explanation for the higher rates of disordered gambling in

this population may be related to the demographics of the sample. People who seek services at UCHC dental clinics have risk factors for disordered gambling identified in other studies of special populations, such as relatively younger age, lower income, and less education (Cunningham-Williams, Cottler, Compton, & Spitznagel, 1998; Feigelman, Wallisch, & Lesieur, 1998; Pasternak & Fleming, 1999; Shaffer et al., 1999; Stinchfield & Winters, 1998; Volberg, 1998; Westphal & Rush, 1996). The prevalence of

disordered gambling in this sample of medical and dental patients is similar to rates reported in substance abusing populations (Feigelman et al., 1998; Lesieur et al., 1986; Petry, 2000b; Shaffer et al., 1999).

Because only one other known study reported on the prevalence of Internet gambling, comparisons of the rates of Internet gambling found in this study to other populations are premature. Only Petry and Mallya's (2001) study provides a comparative perspective. Using a methodology similar to

that of the present study, Petry and Mallya examined rates of Internet gambling among UCHC health center employees ($n = 907$) who, as a group, had an almost identical mean age (42.8) but higher annual income and educational achievement than participants in the present study. Yet Petry and Mallya found a prevalence rate of Internet gambling of just 1.2%, which is a considerable departure from the present study's findings of 8.1%. Because access to the Internet is traditionally correlated with populations that have higher income and educational attainment, the present study's higher rate of Internet gambling was not expected.

The relative difference in Internet gambling rates between the present study and that of Petry and Mallya (2001) may be due to the higher percentage of Level 2 and 3 gamblers found in the present study. Among UCHC employees, Petry and Mallya found a much smaller overall percentage of Level 2–3 gamblers (4.8%) than the present study (26.0%). With the present study's higher overall percentage of problematic gamblers, an associated increase in percentage of Internet gambling may not be surprising. Indeed, 74.2% of Internet gamblers were found to be Level 2 or 3 gamblers, with 64.5% classified as Level 3 gamblers.

Although Internet gambling was the least common gambling activity, the 8.1% ($n = 31$) of participants who reported experience with Internet gambling remains an important finding. Accessibility and use of Internet gambling opportunities are likely to increase with the explosive growth of the Internet. The University of California, Los Angeles (UCLA) Internet Report (UCLA Center for Communication Policy, 2000) indicated that the number of Americans using the Internet exceeded 100 million by 1999. During each day of the first 3 months of 2000, approximately 55,000 individuals logged on to the Internet for the first time (UCLA Center for Communication Policy, 2000). Thus, an increase in Internet use may foster the development of more Level 2 and 3 gamblers, or attract individuals who already have a gambling problem. Indeed, the availability of Internet gambling may draw individuals who seek out isolated and anonymous contexts for their gambling behaviors.

The high rates of disordered gambling found among UCHC patients illustrate the potential for proactive screening and interventions by health professionals. Health professionals typically attend to a range of patient health and behavior correlates, such as alcohol use, sleep, diet, exercise, and other psychosocial factors. These behaviors and contextual attributes are understood to affect, in complex ways, the health outcomes of patients. Yet attention to gambling as a marker of potential comorbidities is still lacking within health clinic settings. Persons struggling with gambling behaviors are often burdened by health and emotional difficulties (Daghestani, 1987a; Pasternak & Fleming, 1999). These problems include substance abuse, circulatory disease, digestive distress, depression, sexual dysfunction, pervasive anxiety, and risky sexual behaviors (Daghestani, 1987b; Lesieur et al., 1986; Miller, 1996a; Petry, 2000a, 2000b). Screening for disordered gambling among patients may enhance the ability of health professionals to intervene in the physical and emotional health of individuals. Screening strategies are particularly important when dealing with populations in which regular visits to dental or general health clinics may be the exception rather than the norm.

With the expansion of localized and Internet gambling, a rise in disordered gambling may be inevitable as individuals gain easier access to gambling opportunities. The consequences of gambling expansion may con-

tinue to negatively affect the health and social contexts of individuals. As interest in treatments for disordered gambling grows (Petry & Armentano, 1999), health professionals should be aware of the signs of disordered gambling and proactively inform patients of the risks involved.

Ms. HOOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LEACH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. DENT), who represents Lehigh University.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in very strong support of H.R. 4411, the Internet Gambling Prohibition and Enforcement Act, for a variety of reasons, not the least of which is that Lehigh University was mentioned. That institution is in my district.

And just to drive the point home, just in today's paper, the father of the young man who was alleged to have robbed a bank to support his gambling habit said that this bill was something that could have helped his son. He said this: "He was addicted. He gambled 12 hours at a time. He gambled everything he had." The father went on to say, "When he was out of money, he did what most addicts do when they are out of their supply. The Internet is flagrantly recruiting under-21-year-olds to gamble . . . This bill would have definitely helped my son."

Finally, while Internet gambling is a \$12 billion worldwide business, it is not by anyone's definition economic development. The revenue from these enterprises is not job-creating. Most Internet gambling funds are destined for locations that exist offshore.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak in strong support of H.R. 4411, the Internet Gambling Prohibition and Enforcement Act.

This legislation gives law enforcement the tools it needs to fight Internet gambling, which is already illegal in this country. Much Internet gambling originates from off-shore locations and thus is dependent upon the electronic transfer of money and wagering information between sites in the United States and these off-shore locations. Unfortunately, one of the major tools in this fight, the Wire Act, which is codified at title 18 United States Code Section 1081, was enacted in 1961, well before the establishment of the Internet or other forms of similar electronic communication. H.R. 4411 clarifies in statute that Internet communications made in furtherance of gambling transactions indeed fall within the scope of the Wire Act and are thus prosecutable.

H.R. 4411 also gives law enforcement some additional authority to block these transactions. It requires the Department of the Treasury and the Federal Reserve to promulgate regulations aimed at preventing transfers of funds related to illegal Internet Gambling. It also gives law enforcement the ability to seek injunctions against those individuals who act to facilitate this gambling.

While Internet gambling is a \$12 billion worldwide business, it is not, anyone's definition, economic development. The revenue from these enterprises is not job-creating; most Internet gambling funds are destined for locations that exist off-shore. Internet gambling is, instead, wealth transfer—in most cases, from many who can least afford it to very few

who don't need the cash. The proliferation of gambling in America—whether it involves playing the slots at a local racetrack, betting on roulette at a tribal casino hundreds of miles from the nearest Indian reservation, or placing wagers on college basketball games with an Internet site headquartered in the Bahamas—has done nothing to make this a healthier, more productive nation. That is why I support this bill.

Ms. HOOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LEACH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF), who has been a phenomenal advocate of this issue.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I want to begin by thanking Mr. LEACH and Mr. GOODLATTE for staying in there when the outside lobbyists were trying to control this institution. And people must know, if you go back and look at history, this institution, this institution, was manipulated by outside lobbyists. So there is a test today whether that outside lobby, outside influence will continue to take place.

With the guilty plea of lobbyist Jack Abramoff and the information revealed about his role in the defeat of the Internet gambling ban a number of years ago, it is time to strengthen the law enforcement tools to crack down on illegal gambling.

With online gambling, people can do it in their bathrobes, as Mr. LEACH said. They can do it when they are standing in line. This is a test. Quite frankly, this is a test for this institution about outside influences, ones that all you have to do is read *The Washington Post* and the *New York Times* over and over and over to see what they have done. They have manipulated this place.

And today, with Mr. LEACH and Mr. GOODLATTE and others, you have an opportunity to reverse the manipulation and pass this bill without amendment.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the legislation offered by my colleagues JIM LEACH and BOB GOODLATTE. I want to take this opportunity to commend them for working together and really sticking with it so that we could have a strong bill on the floor today that takes the strengths of each of their measures to comprehensively address Internet gambling.

As the author of the legislation which established the National Gambling Impact Commission, I have long been concerned about the predatory nature of gambling and the corruption that is often associated with it.

It seems as though every day in the news there is a new scandal related to gambling. Without this important legislation, there is no way to regulate Internet gambling.

Today, gambling is legal in almost every State in the Union and more than 400 tribal casinos operate in over 30 States. Sadly, Internet gambling is a growing problem in America, particularly for our young people.

You may recall that last December, Greg Hogan—a Lehigh University sophomore—made headlines when he robbed a bank in

order to pay his online poker debt of more than \$5,000.

According to a PBS NewsHour report last spring, recent studies indicate that more than 70 percent of youth between the ages of 10 and 17 gambled in the past year, up from 45 percent in 1988.

And of those who gamble online, an Annenberg Public Policy Center study released last fall indicates that almost 15 percent of our young people aged 14–22 gamble online at least once a month. While 15 percent may not set off alarm bells, consider that more than 50 percent of those who gamble once a week show signs of problem gambling.

Gambling—and particularly online gambling—is a growing problem around the country. According to a Sports Illustrated article from last summer, more than 1.8 million online poker players gamble each month.

They wager an average of \$200 million a day. And the industry generates more than \$2.2 billion, that's with a "B," in gross revenue annually.

I am pleased to support the Internet Gambling Prohibition and Enforcement Act that will improve law enforcement tools to address this problem. Additionally, I think we have momentum on our side to address the explosion of gambling.

With the guilty plea of lobbyist Jack Abramoff and the information revealed about his role in the defeat of the Internet gambling ban a number of years ago, it's time to strengthen law enforcement's tools to crack down on illegal Internet gambling.

With online gambling, people can do it in their bathrobes, in their family rooms, in fact they could even do it on their cell phones walking down the street. It's literally available everywhere at any time.

The prevalence of online gambling and its explosive growth is a national disgrace that hurts young people. How will the Congress explain to the American people if it fails to address this issue?

Mr. Speaker, I urge support for this legislation.

Ms. HOOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LEACH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SHADEGG).

Mr. SHADEGG. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I compliment him on this bill. I also compliment the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE) and Chairman OXLEY and Chairman SENSENBRENNER and my colleague, Mr. WOLF, with whose remarks I associate myself.

This is a huge problem. I have observed in my lifetime many, many, many people whose lives have been destroyed by unregulated gambling. Story after story was brought to me when I worked in the Arizona attorney general's office about people whose lives were destroyed because one member of their family became addicted to gambling.

Now, we have regulated gambling in this Nation, and that is one thing and nobody is trying to ban that by this bill. But Internet gambling is totally unregulated gambling, and it victimizes people and it destroys lives.

It seems to me that the critics of this bill, including those in the paper this

morning, say it does not go after every gambling operation in the world. Of course it doesn't. There are regulated gambling organizations which are legitimate and at least have some government oversight.

What this bill goes after is the epidemic of unregulated gambling that is destroying lives that puts a full online casino in every single home in America to corrupt the people there and destroy their lives.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill, and I commend the leaders, including Chairman SENSENBRENNER, who have brought it to the floor.

Ms. HOOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I just have to clarify a few things that have been said. First of all, this bill is about enforcing the law that is already on the books. This is not about prohibiting gambling. States can regulate their own gambling. They can regulate Internet gambling. This is about enforcing the laws.

We had a hearing in Financial Services where the FBI Director was in front of us and he said this is a significant vehicle for money laundering. GAO reports that Internet gambling can be a significant vehicle for money laundering proceeds because they can move large quantities of money around rapidly to obscure criminal origins. Internet gambling generates over \$10 billion in revenues. Nearly 80 percent of those revenues are impossible to account for because illegal gambling sites are located in jurisdictions with no regulation on gambling.

This allows States the prerogative to decide what kind of gambling should be permitted or forbidden within the State borders. Some States say you cannot gamble; other States say you can. The attorneys general of 48 States have said they are in support of this legislation. It will make online gambling impossible for minors. Minors cannot go into brick and mortar facilities right now. It should, in fact, make it inaccessible for minors.

It recognizes the jurisdictional impediments for prosecuting offshore gambling businesses. Financial systems will be required to block money flow to these businesses, cutting off the oxygen for these illegal transactions.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LEACH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PITTS).

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I want to thank my colleagues, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. LEACH, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, for their hard work and leadership on this issue.

Mr. Speaker, it is time that we enforce the law when it comes to Internet gambling.

Dozens of Web sites entice Web surfers to bet online with free software offers. Online sites advertise openly on TV. Stores carry books on how to get rich by gambling online.

The only problem? Online gambling is illegal.

This bill makes that clear and provides mechanisms to effectively enforce the law.

This year Americans will send \$5.9 billion to offshore, unregulated online casinos. The Justice Department warns that many of these sites are fronts for money laundering, drug trafficking, and even terrorist financing. And unregulated online gambling also takes a toll in untold numbers of personal lives destroyed.

Gambling online is unique. No casinos, horse tracks, or betting parlors are required. All you need is a computer, credit card, and Internet access. With that, players are able to play 24 hours a day from the privacy of their homes. Minors are easily able to defy age requirements if they wish to play. And the online environment and credit card payment system combine to promote addiction, bankruptcy, and crime.

Currently, online gambling operations avoid Federal and State law enforcement by locating offshore, and this bill addresses this loophole in three ways: first, it clarifies previous law, making it a Federal felony to use wire communications facilities to transmit bets or wagers. Secondly, it cuts off the flow of money to online gambling sites by regulating the payment systems they use to collect the money. And, finally, it authorizes penalties against those who facilitate illegal online gambling.

Simply put, Mr. Speaker, the law is being flouted, and this bill does something about it. I strongly urge its adoption.

Ms. HOOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time to close.

First of all, in my opening statement there was a person I forgot to thank who has carried this banner in Financial Services for a long time, Mr. BACHUS from Alabama. I thank you for all the hard work you have done on this.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I would like to share some interesting facts from an article written for the New York Times by Matt Schwartz.

Researchers say that Internet gambling is addictive. Players say it is addictive. In fact, the action, the act of placing a bet, and the high that follows has been identified by neurologists as a similar high to doing a line of cocaine. Blood rushes to the face, the hands moisten, and the mouth dries up.

Internet gambling has also dramatically changed the face of addiction. An estimated 1.6 million of the 17 million U.S. college students gambled online last year, mostly on poker. According to a study by the Annenberg Public Policy Center, the number of college males who reported gambling online once or more a week quadrupled in the last year alone. This is a growing addiction.

The stereotypical compulsive gambler is now much more likely to be a teenager or a college student. Before

the rise of online gambling, the typical compulsive gambler was in his thirties or forties and took a decade to run the destructive course. Now online gamblers are running the same course in 18 months or less.

These facts are disturbing and highlight the need for action by this Congress. Again, this bill is a common-sense approach that cuts off the flow of money to Internet gambling Web sites by regulating the payment systems.

And, again, we have to remember these laws are already on the books. What we are trying to do is enforce the laws. The Department of the Treasury and the Federal Reserve will jointly develop policies and procedures for identifying and preventing financial transactions related to illegal Internet gambling. Payment systems will be required to comply with these regulations. Again, States are allowed to regulate gambling within their own States.

□ 1245

I urge my colleagues to end the flow of money to illegal Internet gambling Web sites, and I urge the passage of H.R. 4411.

[From the New York Times, June 11, 2006]

CHAPTER 2: THE GAMBLER; THE HOLD-'EM
HOLDUP

(By Mattathias Schwartz)

Greg Hogan Jr. was on tilt. For months now, Hogan, a 19-year-old Lehigh University sophomore, had been on tilt, and he would remain on tilt for weeks to come. Alone at the computer, usually near the end of one of his long online gambling sessions, the thought "I'm on tilt" would occur to him. Dude, he'd tell himself, you gotta stop. These thoughts sounded the way a distant fire alarm sounds in the middle of a warm bath. He would ignore them and go back to playing poker. "The side of me that said, 'Just one more hand,' was the side that always won," he told me months later. "I couldn't get away from it, not until all my money was gone." In a little more than a year, he had lost \$7,500 playing poker online.

"Tilt" is the poker term for a spell of insanity that often follows a run of bad luck. The tilter goes berserk, blindly betting away whatever capital he has left in an attempt to recoup his losses. Severe tilt can spill over past the poker table, resulting in reputations, careers and marriages being tossed away like so many chips. This is the kind of tilt Hogan had, tilt so indiscriminate that one Friday afternoon this past December, while on his way to see "The Chronicles of Narnia" with two of his closest friends, he cast aside the Greg Hogan everyone knew—class president, chaplain's assistant, son of a Baptist minister—and became Greg Hogan, the bank robber.

On Dec. 9, 2005, Hogan went to see "Narnia" with Kip Wallen, Lehigh's student-senate president, and Matt Montgomery, Hogan's best friend, in Wallen's black Ford Explorer. Hogan, who was sitting in front, asked Wallen to find a bank so he could cash a check, and Wallen pulled over at a small, oatmeal-colored Wachovia. Inside, Hogan paused at the counter for a moment and then joined the line. He handed the teller a note that said he had a gun, which was a bluff. "Are you kidding?" her face seemed to say. He did his best to look as if he weren't. With agonizing slowness, she began assembling the money. Moments later, a thin sheaf of

bills appeared in the tray: \$2,871. Hogan stuffed it into his backpack, turned around and walked back out to the car.

The movie ended, and the trio returned to campus. Hogan went immediately to Sigma Phi Epsilon, his fraternity, and used some of the stolen money to pay back brothers who had lent him hundreds of dollars. He then joined a few friends at an off-campus pizzeria for dinner. Someone's cellphone rang, with the news that police had stormed the Sig Ep house. No one knew why. Hogan stayed silent. After dinner, his friends dropped him off at orchestra practice. Allentown police officers were waiting for him. They handcuffed him and took him to headquarters, where he confessed almost immediately.

Hogan's first call was to his parents back home in Ohio. They had just finished eating dinner at T.G.I. Friday's. "He was at the end of himself," Greg Hogan Sr. told me. "He couldn't believe he had done it. Not that he was denying anything, but he felt like he was watching another person's life."

To wired college students today, Internet gambling is as familiar as beer, late-night pizza and the Saturday night hook-up. Poker—particularly Texas hold 'em—is the game of choice. Freshmen arrive already schooled by ESPN in the legend of Chris MoneyMaker, the dough-faced 27-year-old accountant who deposited \$40 into his PokerStars.com account and parlayed it into a \$2.5 million win at the World Series of Poker in Las Vegas. Throughout the dorms and computer labs and the back rows of 100-level lecture halls you can hear the crisp wsshpp, wsshpp, wsshpp of electronic hands being dealt as more than \$2 billion in untaxed revenue is sucked into overseas accounts each year.

Researchers say that Internet poker is addictive. Players say that it's addictive. The federal government says that it's illegal. But colleges have done little to stop its spread on campus. Administrators who would never consider letting Budweiser install taps in dorm rooms have made high-speed Internet access a standard amenity, putting every student with a credit card minutes away from 24-hour high-stakes gambling. Online casinos advertise heavily on sites directed at college students like CollegeHumor.com, where students post pictures of themselves playing online poker during lectures with captions like: "Gambling while in class. Who doesn't think that wireless Internet is the greatest invention ever?" Some schools have allowed sites to establish a physical on-campus presence by sponsoring live cash tournaments; the sites partner with fraternities and sports teams, even give away a semester's tuition, all as inducements to convert the casual dorm-lounge poker player to a steady online customer. An unregulated network of offshore businesses has been given unfettered access to students, and the students have been given every possible accommodation to bet and lose to their hearts' content. Never before have the means to lose so much been so available to so many at such a young age.

An estimated 1.6 million of 17 million U.S. college students gambled online last year, mostly on poker. According to a study by the Annenberg Public Policy Center, the number of college males who reported gambling online once a week or more quadrupled in the last year alone. "The kids really think they can log on and become the next world champion," says Jeffrey Derevensky, who studies youth problem gambling at McGill University in Montreal. "This is an enormous social experiment. We don't really know what's going to happen."

Greg Hogan is far from the only college student to see the game's role in his life grow from a hobby to a destructive obses-

sion. Researchers from the University of Connecticut Health Center interviewed a random sample of 880 college students and found that 1 out of every 4 of the 160 or so online gamblers in the study fit the clinical definition of a pathological gambler, suggesting that college online-poker addicts may number in the hundreds of thousands. Many, like Lauren Patrizi, a 21-year-old senior at Loyola University in Chicago, have had weeks when they're playing poker during most of their waking hours. Rarely leaving their rooms, they take their laptops with them to bed, fall asleep each night in the middle of a hand and think, talk and dream nothing but poker. By the time Patrizi finally quit, the game seemed to be both the cause of all her problems and her only means of escaping them. "I kept on playing so I wouldn't have to look at what poker had done to my bank account, my relationships, my life," she told me.

Other addicts, like Alex Alkula, a 19-year-old living outside Columbus, Ohio, decide to "go pro," drop out of school and wind up broke and sleeping on their friends' couches. Alkula, who left the Art Institute of Pittsburgh after five months, now makes his living dealing hold 'em in private home games and organizing tournaments in bars. Having overdrawn four bank accounts, Alkula can no longer play online himself. But when he gets home from work at 3 or 4 in the morning, he turns on his computer, clicks on Full Tilt Poker and watches the players' cards flicker on the screen until dawn. "I can't get away from it," he told me. "And really, I don't want to. I'll keep playing poker even if it means being broke for the rest of my life. I've fallen in love with the game."

In its outline, Hogan's story closely resembles that of the stereotypical compulsive gambler. Before the rise of online poker, however, such a story typically involved a man in his 30's or 40's and took a decade or more to run its course. Greg Hogan, on the other hand, went from class president to bank robber in 16 months. His fall took place not at the blackjack table or the track but within the familiar privacy of his computer screen, where he was seldom more than a minute away from his next hand of poker. He'd been brought up too well to waste himself in some smoky gambling den and knew too much to play a mere game of chance. He wanted to compete against his peers, to see his superior abilities yield dollars for the first time, a transaction he equated with adulthood. His stubborn faith in his own ability—a trait that had served him so well through his first 19 years—proved to be his undoing.

Today's ruined gamblers are often too young to know any better—too young, in fact, to legally gamble in most U.S. casinos. Until now, these young addicts were ignored by the news media, which swooned over the top of the poker pyramid, the Chris MoneyMakers and the ESPN heroes, the guys in the wraparound sunglasses and the cowboy hats who made the hustler's art seem somehow noble and athletic. No one was interested in whose losses keep the poker economy humming, not until a Baptist minister's son robbed a bank.

A minister's eldest boy learns to perform early in life. On Sundays, Greg's mother, Karen, would dress him and his two brothers in matching slacks and blazers and take them and their sister to hear Greg Sr. preach. The congregation looked on as the boys followed Greg Jr.'s polite, attentive example. Schooled at home through eighth grade, the straw-haired, blue-eyed boy emulated his father's steady gaze, the soft but firm quality in his voice. He saw that others would come to rely on him if he revealed only his strongest side. When Greg Sr. ran

for City Council, Greg Jr. enlisted his playmates to help him campaign door to door. Neighbors began calling Greg "the General." When it came to music, Greg was like a boat on a still pond—one small push from his parents and he'd glide on toward the goal. Karen, a psychiatric nurse, started him on the piano at 5. Greg Sr. worked a second job to help pay for \$50-an-hour private music lessons for his daughter and three boys. By 13, Greg had twice played onstage at Carnegie Hall. Music won him a scholarship to the prestigious University School, a day school outside Cleveland, where his classmates noticed his oddly mature ways and dubbed him "the 30-year-old man." By graduation, he'd developed something of an ego. "Greg will always be a people person," wrote his adviser in an evaluation letter. "Perhaps he should set his sights a little lower and just become president of the United States."

Hogan, who had palled around with the sons of bank executives at his high school, threw himself into this new environment. Even before his father had said goodbye to head back to Ohio, Greg announced his plan to run for class president. He played his first hands of live hold 'em with real money that night, a way to break the ice with the guys from his hall in the dorm lounge. A few weeks later, guided by one of his roommate's friends, Hogan opened his first online-poker account at PokerStars.com. He chose a screen name that would carry his new school's banner all around the world: geelehigh. He'd met someone from two floors down who had lost \$100—a fortune, it seemed—online. He decided to stick to the play-money tables. Within 10 minutes, Hogan was playing his first online hands.

A few days later he met another friend of his roommate's. Hogan claims that he remembers only his nickname, Phys. When he turned 21, Phys told Hogan, he would plunk down \$10,000 and become the youngest player ever to win poker's greatest prize—the World Series of Poker No Limit Texas Hold 'Em bracelet. He then showed Hogan where he planned on getting that kind of money. He clicked on the PokerStars icon on Hogan's computer, typed in a user name and password, clicked on "Cashier." And there it was, Phys's "real money" balance: more than \$160,000. Hogan clucked his tongue. "Un-be-lievable," he said, almost to himself. He knew that the money was indeed real. All Phys had to do was click on the "Cash Out" button and wait two weeks, and he'd receive a six-figure check in the mail. Four years' tuition, sitting there like a high score. It was absurd.

The next week, geelehigh used his debit card to make a \$75 PokerStars deposit. He received a \$25 "deposit bonus," which wouldn't clear until he'd played several hundred hands. The money was real now, but it still felt as ephemeral as it did at the play-money tables: \$100 was a digitized chip icon, an oval of black pixels on his computer screen. Green ovals were \$25, red ovals \$5. All were smaller than a grain of rice. When Hogan clicked on the "Bet" or "Raise" buttons, the chips made a chik sound and floated across the glowing table before melting into the pot. These tiny digital chips represented money controlled by a corporation in Costa Rica. The "cards" themselves were really just bits of data, "shuffled" by a random-number generator on a Mohawk Indian reservation in Quebec. The nine players at Hogan's table were scattered all over the world, each sitting alone at his screen, trying to take money from the other eight. Eventually, in chunks of \$50, then \$100, he took two summers' earnings, money his parents had given him for books and expenses, hundreds of dollars in loans from friends, \$2,000 in savings bonds bought in his name

(bonds he took from the family safe) and turned it into digital chips: \$7,500 in all.

Online, Hogan would play 60 to 100 hands an hour—three times the number of his live games. There was no more shuffling between hands, no more 30-second gaps to chat with his friends or consider quitting. Each hand interlocked with the next. The effect was paralyzing, narcotic. "Internet poker induces a trancelike state," says Derevensky, the McGill professor, who once treated a 17-year-old Canadian boy who lost \$30,000, much of it at PokerStars. "The player loses all track of time, where they are, what they're doing." When I spoke with an online hold-'em player from Florida who had lost a whopping \$250,000 online, he told me: "It fried my brain. I would roll out of bed, go to my computer and stay there for 20 hours. One night after I went to sleep, my dad called. I woke up instantly, picked up the phone and said, 'I raise.'"

A raked poker game cannot survive unless some players either overestimate their abilities or are willing to keep playing despite consistent losses. Fish, then, are the chum that keeps the rest of the poker ecosystem alive. Poker message boards monitor which sites are teeming with geelehighs and which have been leached dry. To stay in business, sites must attract fish, hold them for as long as possible and replace them when they go broke. According to Mike Shichtman, a professional gambler who consults for the online site Pacific Poker, there is "giant concern" in the industry that the total number of fish may be dwindling. It is, he adds, a trend that can be reversed only by tapping new markets.

In a few weeks, Hogan had run his initial \$75 up to \$300. Then, in November, came "the hand that got me hooked." Hogan drew a king-high flush and bet all \$300. When his opponent called the bet and showed his ace-high flush, Hogan felt an impotent rage that broke on his forehead and coursed through his body. Tilt. He cursed, shut down the program in disgust and vowed never to play online again. Four days later, however, he felt the traces of an urge as visceral as the need to eat.

Hogan was craving "action," the gambler's drug. "Getting action" is the act of placing a bet; being "in action" is the high that follows, a state of arousal that neurologists have likened to doing a line of cocaine. Blood rushes to the face, the hands moisten, the mouth dries up. Time slows down to a continuous present, an unending series of build-ups and climaxes. The gains and losses begin to feel the same. Action had already appeared intermittently in Hogan's life—when he cheered the Ohio State Buckeyes through the last seconds of overtime, when his father called him with Lehigh's admissions decision in hand. Poker gave him the same rush whenever he wanted it, for hours on end.

Back in Ohio, Hogan's October bank statement arrived with two \$50 PSTARS withdrawals. His father called, asked why he'd waste money like that. Greg promised to stop. He played again that day. He had not and would not read any of the half-dozen books that together give a rough grasp of how hard hold-em is to master. He had no idea that many of his opponents were self-styled professionals using a special program called Poker Tracker to analyze betting patterns and seek out fish like geelehigh. There were always some of these pros online, some playing 8 or 12 tables at once to leverage their advantage. They were waiting for him the night Lehigh's football team lost to rival Lafayette, when Hogan, who'd organized a cheering section, felt a little down and once again pushed aside his father's warnings. They followed him home over Thanksgiving

weekend in November 2004, where, amid the clutter of his father's small basement office, he watched the World Series of Poker on TV, never changed out of his pajamas and played online for 10 hours a day. He lost \$1,500, every penny he'd taken to school with him. Upstairs, the Hogans wondered what was wrong with their son.

"It's just play money, Dad," he told his father, who learned the truth when an overdraft notice arrived from Greg's bank. Greg Jr.'s phone rang the moment he returned to Lehigh. It was Greg Sr., who reminded Greg that the \$1,500 had come from friends and relatives who didn't give it to him so he could gamble it. Hogan, distraught, e-mailed Phys and begged him to cover the loss. Phys agreed, so long as Greg would stop playing. "You're a fish," he said. "You need to stop."

Greg had begun to daydream about poker during student-council meetings, at orchestra practice, whenever he had a free moment. Soon, Phys's \$1,500 had melted away. Hogan's parents arranged for him to meet with a Lehigh counselor. He was told that live poker was harmless but to stay away from online. For a time, the counseling worked. Hogan did not gamble during spring semester. But that summer, back at home in Ohio, Hogan was checking up on his friends at Facebook.com when he saw a PartyPoker ad: make a \$50 deposit, get a \$50 bonus. He'd been coveting a red Jeep and remembered the times he'd run \$100 up to \$500. Ten \$500 sessions, get the Cherokee, don't tilt and quit. And he did win, at first. Then, as always, his opponents began to outmaneuver him. "I kept going back online, depositing another \$50, winning, withdrawing," he recalls. "It happened a few times, but then I wouldn't be withdrawing. And then I'd just keep putting money in 'cause I kept losing."

In July, at his parents' behest, Hogan attended a few Cleveland-area Gamblers Anonymous meetings, which proved handy when a friend took him to a Canadian casino to play live poker. He found it easy to play a disciplined game under the appraising eyes of older strangers and won \$500. The G.A. meetings had taught him to recognize the fish at the table. Except for the one sitting in his seat.

Back at Lehigh that September, Hogan sometimes found himself shoe-horning counseling meetings between online-poker sessions. To his friends and professors he was a terrific success, the easygoing leader who organized landscaping projects around the Sig Ep house and hobnobbed with Lehigh's wealthy trustees at dinner parties. But to his parents, his situation was growing desperate. Hogan had reneged on his promise to attend G.A. meetings in Bethlehem. Withdrawals and overdrafts continued to appear on his bank statements. "I really don't want to do this anymore, but I don't know how to stop," Greg told his father. Greg Sr. then made the six-hour drive from Ohio to install a \$99 program called GamBlock on his son's computer. Highly regarded among gambling counselors, GamBlock makes it impossible for users to access any Internet casinos. (The company's founder, David Warr, says that half of his customer base, which he will only put in the "thousands," is connected to a college or university.)

Hogan soon found a way to circumvent GamBlock, gambling by night in the library's computer lounges. "It was funny to see how many other kids were playing," he says. "By this point I didn't really care so much who saw me." Greg Sr. realized what was happening and asked the administration to lock poker sites out of the public terminals. He says he was told that nothing could be done. As November approached, the wall Hogan had built between his Lehigh life and his poker life had begun to crack. He would

borrow \$100 or \$200 from his fraternity brothers and fail to pay them back by his self-imposed deadlines. He would skip classes and meetings for long binges in the fraternity lounge, gambling through the night and catching a few hours' sleep before noon. People he hardly knew were asking him what was the matter. On Oct. 19, when a fellow Sig Ep sent the house an e-mail asking if anyone wanted to try to hit a record Powerball jackpot, Greg sent this reply, a message that went to all 60 of his brothers: "O what the hell, maybe my bad luck can change??? Please God???"

The end came quickly, a weeklong series of 14-hour binges at the end of November. "There was very little thinking," he told me. "I'd get up and lose it. Get up, make another deposit, lose it again. As soon as I lost, I had to get more money in my account immediately. My whole body was shaking as I waited for the program to load, I wanted to play so badly." On Nov. 30, 2005, he lost the last \$150 in his account during a six-hour session in the Sig Ep lounge that ended when a friend told him dinner was ready. "I was up about \$500, and I was like, 'I'll play two more hands,'" Hogan says. "Then one more hand, and one more after that. And in those last three or four hands, I lost it all. All the muscles in my body gave way." He fell asleep, completely broke. All his poker accounts were at zero. His checking account had a negative balance. At the Sig Ep winter social, the fraternity treasurer told Hogan he would be kicked out if he failed to come up with \$200 in social fees. Having bailed him out twice before, Greg's parents refused to give him the money and were considering pulling him out of Lehigh altogether. Hogan spent the next week wandering around the Sig Ep house in a daze, skipping classes and drinking himself into a stupor each night.

"It was the weirdest thing I've ever experienced in my life," he said. "Like an out-of-body experience. I was watching myself walk around. Watching myself go and eat food. Watching myself take a shower, but not actually doing those things. I remember looking in the mirror, and it was not me I was seeing in the reflection."

The night before the bank robbery, Greg spoke with his father one last time. Greg Sr. remembers what he heard in his son's voice. The tiredness. The lack of presence.

"Greg," he asked, "are you gambling?" Greg said what he always said. "Nah, Dad. It's been a while since I've done any of that." Greg Sr. had gotten used to his son's half-truths, the "wishing out loud," as he calls it. He knew it was useless to press further. "O.K., Gregory. I love you. Good night."

I met Greg Hogan Jr. for breakfast one morning this spring, at a diner a few miles from Lehigh. (As Hogan was in the process of negotiating a plea with the county's D.A., I agreed to ask him only about poker and refer all questions about the day of the bank robbery to his attorney.) He had recently completed an inpatient gambling-treatment program in Louisiana, where he wasn't allowed to have more than \$5 on him at any time. "I haven't played a hand of poker in 90 days," he said, with a recovering addict's confessional cheer. He is 20, but his jowly face and all-business baritone make him seem much older. Take away the American Eagle shirt and the Ohio State Buckeyes cap and he'd resemble a young, pale Harry Truman.

Beside us sat Greg Sr. and Karen, still fuming over media accounts that they are "affluent." On the contrary, they have scrimped to put children through college. After paying Greg's treatment costs, legal fees and bank debts, they expect to be out \$35,000. Hogan's lawyer has been fielding calls from bookers at "Oprah," "Montel" and "Good Morning America," all drawn in by the irresistible "good kid robs bank" story.

Some \$60 billion was bet last year in online poker games, two-thirds of which came from the United States. The vast majority of this money moves from player to player. About \$3 billion wound up as revenue in the form of rake, a figure that is growing by about 20 percent per year, making poker the fastest-growing segment of the \$12 billion online-gambling industry. Unlike their brick-and-mortar counterparts, online casinos don't have to pay for dealers, free drinks or air-conditioning, and they enjoy profit margins as high as 60 percent.

There are more than 400 online card rooms operating today, offering every variety of poker game and every level of stakes. Hold 'em, the most popular game, can be played for anywhere from pennies to tens of thousands of dollars a hand. Like pornography before it, gambling is shedding its stigma, transitioning from the black market to Wall Street, from a back-room vice to ubiquitous "content." PartyGaming, the largest operator, is valued at about \$10 billion on the London Stock Exchange. Its shares are held by Goldman Sachs, Merrill Lynch and other top Wall Street firms. Five years from now, if the plans of PartyGaming and other Internet casinos come to pass, consumers will be able to place bets on their cellphones and P.D.A.'s while waiting for a table in a restaurant.

The public visibility of online-poker seems to be growing as fast as its revenues. Calvin Ayre, the globetrotting founder of the online card room and sports-betting site Bodog.com, spends \$50 million a year promoting himself and his company as a Hefner-like lifestyle brand. He has run ads in *Esquire* and *Vice* magazine and on Gawker Media's sites in which Ayre himself often appears as a dapper, rakish bachelor, personally embodying both the new poker wealth and the rewards his younger customers hope the game might bring. The image has caught on—this March he appeared on the cover of *Forbes's* Billionaires issue.

While the Department of Justice maintains that online poker violates U.S. laws, not a single player or site has been indicted, and online gambling remains as available as pirated music. To shut down Internet gambling, the D.O.J. would either have to start monitoring what we download from the Internet or raid legal, licensed businesses in Antigua, Britain, Costa Rica and other countries where it has no jurisdiction. The D.O.J. has succeeded in persuading some credit-card companies to stop financing online-poker accounts, but this hasn't stopped the flow of rake overseas. U.S. players simply move funds through offshore third-party "e-wallets" like Neteller and Firepay, which charge a small fee and then pass the money on to the sites.

"The Department of Justice takes the position that online poker is illegal," says the former U.S. attorney Jim Martin, who led the first phases of the department's campaign against online-gambling advertising. "But I don't think they have much of a motive to go after individual bettors at all."

Analysts say that online gambling's gray legal status allows operators to avoid paying more than \$7 billion a year in federal taxes. And \$7 billion is a lot of tax money to leave on the table—nearly half of NASA's budget for next year. It's probably too much for this ambiguous state of affairs to continue for much longer. Late last month, the House Judiciary Committee approved a bill introduced by Representative Bob Goodlatte that would make it harder—but far from impossible—for players to move their money offshore, while leaving the question of domestic online gambling to the states. With Congress unlikely to pass any law authorizing federal oversight of our online activities, Internet

gambling's near future appears as healthy as illegal downloading's. In the long term, the federal government's response is likely to resemble either its response to tobacco, with high taxes and more rigorous controls over marketing and access to young people, or to marijuana, a costly and mostly fruitless campaign to eradicate a demand-driven business by cutting off the supply.

With plenty of disposable income and spare time, college students constitute one of the gambling industry's most coveted demographics. "We've been surprised by this natural, organic groundswell of demand from the college audience," says Jason Reindorp, marketing director for AbsolutePoker.com, which gave away a semester's tuition to the winner of a college-only online tournament and promoted its Web site at halftime during N.C.A.A. basketball tournament games. Like many sites, AbsolutePoker.com enlists players in multilevel marketing programs. Known as "affiliates," players are rewarded with a \$75 bonus or a percentage of the rake each time they find AbsolutePoker a new customer. Reindorp says that AbsolutePoker relies on students to make sure all this jibes with campus policy. "The student audience is very responsible," he says. "They know how to avoid getting into trouble by breaking their school's rules, just like they know how to avoid playing beyond their means."

I'd heard the same from almost every online player I'd spoken with: I lose big, I win big, but at the end of the day, I come out ahead. Johnson did know one losing player who'd lost several thousand dollars and had to take a \$6.25-an-hour job at this very smoothie shop to pay for his books.

Johnson said Hogan never had much of a reputation among Lehigh's hard-cord poker players. "The funny thing is, he wasn't even in that deep," he told me. "Five thousand is nothing. I know whole halls full of kids who play the thousand-dollar buy-in No Limit tables. If everyone did the same thing when they lost five large," he added with a chuckle, "well, there'd be a lot more bank robberies."

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LEACH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, very briefly, I would simply like to express a lot of personal appreciation to Chairman MIKE OXLEY of the Banking Committee, SPENCER BACHUS and all those who have preceded us on this side, to Chairman SENBRENNER and, extraordinarily, to BOB GOODLATTE who has led this movement for quite a long time.

I also want to express a great deal of respect for points in the opposition, RON PAUL, our distinguished Libertarian leader in the House, and BARNEY FRANK, who from a liberal perspective has taken a Libertarian view, have thoughts that deserve great respect; and I have always admired the work of the ranking member, JOHN CONYERS, on this committee.

But I want to just conclude with this observation. This is not a partisan bill. It is not an ideological bill. As Ms. HOOLEY very thoughtfully reflected, from a Democratic perspective, this is a family bill, and this bill, I am hopeful, will get a lot of support from both sides, and it will get a little opposition from both sides. This is for the good of the American people, and in the development of legislation like this, outside

groups do play a role. Sometimes they are nefarious; that happens around here. Sometimes they are high-minded.

When I think of Marty Gold of the NFL, when I think of Cynthia Abrams from United Methodist Church, I think of really fine Americans who have indicated that we should act in this area, and I am honored to work with them.

I urge support for this legislation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman's time has expired.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 4411, the Internet Gambling Prohibition and Enforcement Act. The version we consider today merges H.R. 4777, the Internet Gambling Prohibition Act, offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE), and H.R. 4411, the Unlawful Internet Gambling Enforcement Act of 2006 introduced by the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. LEACH).

I am pleased to have worked closely with Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. LEACH and members of the Committee on Financial Services to draft a compromise on this important legislation which has allowed it to come to the floor today.

In recent years, illegal online gambling activities and their adverse social consequences have risen dramatically. Americans will send \$6 billion to unregulated, offshore, online casinos this year, 50 percent of the \$12 billion wagered on Internet gambling worldwide.

The Department of Justice has warned that Internet gambling sites are often fronts for money laundering, drug trafficking and even terrorist financing. Furthermore, these sites evade vigorous U.S.-based gambling regulations that restrict gambling by minors, protect chronic gamblers and ensure the integrity of the games.

The characteristics of Internet gambling are unique: online players can gamble 24 hours a day from home; children may play without sufficient age verification; and betting with a credit card can undercut a player's perception of the value of cash, leading to addiction, bankruptcy and crime. Young people and compulsive gamblers are particularly vulnerable.

The legislation we consider today clarifies the application of the Wire Act to the Internet, and prohibits not only sports betting, but traditional gambling such as online poker, blackjack and roulette.

It further provides Federal, State and tribal law enforcement with the tools to combat Internet gambling and cuts off revenue to those who profit from this destructive and illegal activity. The bill accomplishes this by prohibiting the use of financial instruments such as credit cards, electronic fund transfers, checks and drafts to pay for online gambling bets. It also increases the criminal penalties for violation of the Wire Act from a maximum of 2 years to a maximum of 5 years.

Legislation to address illegal online gambling is strongly supported by a

broad and diverse coalition representing religious organizations, professional sports leagues, entertainment companies, the financial services industry, and State lottery commissions. Moreover, the unique national and global character of the Internet requires a clear and decisive congressional response to illegal activities that occur online.

The time to pass strong prohibitions against Internet gambling is now. I urge my colleagues to pass this vital legislation.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY,
Washington, DC, July 10, 2006.

Hon. JOE BARTON,
Chairman, Committee on Energy and Commerce,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN BARTON: Thank you for your recent letter concerning the Committee on Energy and Commerce's jurisdictional interest in H.R. 4411, the "Unlawful Internet Gambling Enforcement Act of 2006, as amended." I acknowledge the Committee on Energy and Commerce's jurisdictional interest in the amendment in the nature of a substitute to H.R. 4411 and appreciate your willingness to waive further consideration of the legislation in order to expedite its consideration on the House floor.

I agree that by foregoing consideration of the amendment in the nature of a substitute to H.R. 4411, the Committee on Energy and Commerce does not waive jurisdiction over subject matter contained in this or similar legislation. In addition, I agree to support representation from the Committee on Energy and Commerce for provisions of H.R. 4411 determined to be within its jurisdiction in the event of a House-Senate conference on the legislation.

Finally, as requested, I will include a copy of your letter and this response in the Congressional Record during floor consideration of this legislation.

Sincerely,
F. JAMES SENSENBRENNER, Jr.,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND COMMERCE,
Washington, DC, July 10, 2006.

Hon. F. JAMES SENSENBRENNER, JR.,
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN SENSENBRENNER: I understand that the House plans to consider H.R. 4411, as amended, the Unlawful Internet Gambling Enforcement Act of 2006, this week. The proposed amendment in the nature of a substitute contains provisions that fall within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

I recognize your desire to join Chairman Oxley and bring this legislation before the House in an expeditious manner. Accordingly, I will not exercise my Committee's right to a referral. By agreeing to waive its consideration of the bill, however, the Energy and Commerce Committee does not waive its jurisdiction over the subject matter contained in the amendment in the nature of a substitute to H.R. 4411. In addition, the Energy and Commerce Committee reserves its right to seek conferees for any provisions of the bill that are within its jurisdiction during any House-Senate conference that may be convened on this or similar legislation. I ask for your commitment to support any request by the Energy and Commerce Committee for conferees on H.R. 4411 or similar legislation.

I request that you include this letter in the Congressional Record during consideration

of H.R. 4411. Thank you for your attention to these matters.

Sincerely,

JOE BARTON,
Chairman.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 4 minutes.

I just want to tell my friend, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF), that if he thinks we have fixed the Abramoff problem of this House by passing this legislation, I am sure that Jack is somewhere saying, Fooled again.

Now, I oppose this bill for the same reasons that the Traditional Values Coalition opposes the bill, namely, that we are not doing the complete job; and if we were, I would be here as an advocate. But this legislation only bans certain forms of online gambling, while expanding legal authorization for certain favored special interests, including betting on the lotteries and interstate horse racing.

This latter exception, the one reserved especially for the horse racing industry, is a great concern because in the last few months the horse racing industry has made it clear that they intend to use the carve-out to go after who, children, in order to encourage them to engage in online gambling. This is a big problem for me.

But could we not have figured this out without going to the Baltimore Sun or listening to the chief executive officer of the Maryland Jockey Club tell us about the decades-long slump in attendance and wagering at the track and the ability of the Internet to turn that around?

In response, Mr. DeFrancis declared, "Over the 25 years I've been in this industry, not one day has gone by when I haven't heard people complaining that our customer base is getting older and we can't attract young people. And this gives us an opportunity to expand into the youth market unlike any we've ever had before."

Do you not get it? With this carve-out, we are starting something that is a slippery slope, and it has been thankfully remarked on by a number of people here.

So, regardless of one's position with respect to whether or not Internet gambling should be banned, we can all, and should, agree that innocent children should not be taken advantage of when they go online. As is the case when it comes to protecting kids from pornography and other forms of online predators, children should be equally protected from those who make it their mission to encourage underage gambling.

So, for that reason, the bill goes in the wrong direction and threatens to make an increasing problem even worse.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE), the father of half this bill.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, first, I want to thank Chairman SENSENBRENNER for his long support of our efforts on this legislation. He is now in his sixth year as chairman of the Judiciary Committee, and this legislation even predates his strong leadership of the committee.

I want to thank most especially Congressman JIM LEACH of Iowa, who has worked very, very hard and very, very long in the Financial Services Committee to accomplish these same goals that we have worked on in the Judiciary Committee. Bringing these two bills together for the first time is a major accomplishment and provides the strongest bill that has ever been offered to deal with this scourge of Internet gambling.

I am also deeply grateful and indebted to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BOUCHER) who has been the lead Democratic cosponsor of the Judiciary version of the legislation with me for many years, as well, and I thank him for his efforts.

There are many Members on both sides of the aisle who have made great contributions, Congresswoman HOOLEY, Congressman CARDOZA of California, many other Members on the Democratic side who will join with us to finally pass this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, gambling on the Internet has become an extremely lucrative business. Internet gambling is now estimated to be a \$12 billion industry, with approximately \$6 billion coming from bettors based in the U.S. It has been reported that there are as many as 2,300 gambling sites, and the Department of Justice has testified that these offshore, fly-by-night Internet gambling operations can serve as vehicles for money laundering by organized crime syndicates and terrorists.

The anonymity of the Internet makes it much easier for minors to gamble online. In addition, online gambling can result in addiction, bankruptcy, divorce, crime and moral decline just as with traditional forms of gambling, the costs of which must be ultimately borne by society.

In fact, I have been contacted by a constituent in my district whose son fell prey to an Internet gambling addiction. Faced with insurmountable debt from Internet gambling, he took his own life.

We heard earlier from Congressman DENT and his constituent, whose son robbed a bank as a college student because he could not meet his Internet gambling debts, and the final thing that the father had to say just in today's Associated Press story, This bill would have definitely helped my son.

That is what we are about here today. As Congressman LEACH said, this is about protecting America's families.

Traditionally, States have had the authority to permit or prohibit gambling within their borders. With the development of the Internet, however, State prohibitions and regulations gov-

erning gambling have become increasingly hard to enforce as electronic communications move freely across borders.

Current Federal law already prohibits interstate gambling over telephone wires. However, these laws, which were written before the invention of the Internet, have become outdated. The Internet Gambling Prohibition and Enforcement Act brings the current prohibition against wireline interstate gambling up to speed with the development of new technology. It also makes clear once and for all that the prohibition is not limited to sports-related bets and wagers, and would provide Federal, State and tribal law enforcement with new injunctive authority to prevent and restrain violations of the law.

In addition, H.R. 4411 prohibits a gambling business from accepting certain forms of noncash payment, including credit cards and electronic fund transfers. In order to block transactions going overseas, the legislation also requires the Federal Reserve Board and the Treasury Department to issue regulations to help banks block illegal gambling transactions.

H.R. 4411 also protects the rights of citizens in each State to decide through their State legislatures whether to permit gambling within their borders. The regulation of intrastate gambling has always been within the jurisdiction of each State, and this bill leaves the regulation of wholly intrastate betting to the States with tight controls to ensure that such betting or wagering does not extend beyond their borders or to minors.

The opponents of this legislation have a lot to lose. Offshore, online gambling Web sites are cash cows, and the greed that propels these companies leads them to solicit bettors in the United States despite the fact that the Department of Justice already believes this activity is illegal. The greed that motivates many of these offshore establishments has also motivated nefarious lobbyists such as Jack Abramoff to spread misinformation about previous attempts of the Congress to ban online gambling.

Internet gambling is a serious problem that must be stopped. The Internet Gambling Prohibition and Enforcement Act will help eliminate this harmful activity before it spreads further.

This is legislation that was defeated by Jack Abramoff before. He is still out there with other lobbyists trying to do it again. Support the legislation. Defeat the amendment.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT), an esteemed member of the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I oppose the bill because it does not prohibit Internet gambling; it only tries to prohibit run-

ning an Internet gambling operation. But because of the nature of the Internet, it is probably unlikely to do that, and that is because even if we are successful in closing down business sites in the United States or in countries we can get to cooperate, it will be ineffective because it will have no effect on those operations run outside of the reach of the Department of Justice.

Furthermore, it does not prohibit illegal gambling, just running the operations so that gamblers will be as free as they are now to gamble over the Internet.

Further, Mr. Speaker, it provides a credit card prohibition. We heard from witnesses during our hearings that this will create an enforcement nightmare for financial institutions because it requires them to stop and look for illegal Internet gambling transactions.

□ 1300

It is hard to identify those transactions, because they are not going to be identified as an illegal Internet transaction. It will just be you may have a company with one code for all payments, even though the company may have many activities, including Internet gambling.

Just as Caesar's Palace has a hotel and a gaming operation, a foreign company may have a hotel and a casino and an Internet gaming operation which is legal in that country, all paid to a single account. What about e-cash or electronic payment systems, or an escrow agent located in another country? All the bank knows is that the payment came from PayPal or went to some escrow agent.

With some Internet gambling operations being legal, how would the final institution distinguish between what is legal and what is illegal? Furthermore, we should not overestimate the cooperation we might get from other countries. The Internet gambling Web sites were virtually unheard of a few years ago and now represent billion-dollar businesses and are growing at phenomenal rates.

Over 85 foreign countries allow some form of gambling online, and that number is likely to grow as well. So what governments are likely to cooperate with us in prosecuting businesses that they authorize to operate?

Even if we are successful in getting cooperation from some countries, it would simply increase the profit opportunities for sites located in uncooperative countries, especially those with whom the United States does not have normal diplomatic relations, and those sites would be unregulated with no consumer protections.

Again, we have heard these stories about the problems of Internet gambling. But this bill does not prohibit Internet gambling. It prohibits running the operation. If we wanted to be effective in prosecuting illegal gambling on the Internet, we would prosecute the individual gamblers. A few sting operations would get the word out that if

you gamble on the Internet, you will be caught, because the money trail will lead back to each individual Internet gambler.

So as long as individuals can gamble over the Internet with impunity, the market will be provided for them from some place.

Mr. Speaker, this bill does not prohibit Internet gambling, just tries to prohibit running the operation in a jurisdiction within the reach of the Department of Justice, then it sets up an impossible regulatory scheme, requiring banks to figure out which of billions of transactions might be related to illegal Internet gambling.

If we want to prohibit Internet gambling, let's debate that. Meanwhile, we should defeat this bill.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BOUCHER).

(Mr. BOUCHER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BOUCHER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin for yielding this time and commend him for his work on this measure.

Mr. Speaker, it has been my pleasure to work with our Virginia colleague, Mr. GOODLATTE, in introducing this bipartisan measure that is before the House today, which will crack down on the growing problem of illegal offshore gambling as well as illegal gambling that crosses State lines by way of connections to the Internet.

These activities take billions of dollars out of our national economy each year, serve as a vehicle for money laundering, undermine families, and threaten the ability of States to enforce their own laws. The time to approve a ban on Internet gambling has now arrived. The basic policy that we are promoting in this bill was adopted in the 1960s when Congress passed the Wire Act. That law makes it illegal to carry out a gambling transaction through use of the telephone network. We are modernizing the Wire Act to account for the arrival of the Internet as a communications medium by making it illegal to use the Internet for gambling transactions as well.

In view of the fact that people connect to the Internet by means other than telephone lines, and that a large amount of Internet traffic does not even touch the public switched telephone network, we think it is necessary to specify that prohibited traffic which crosses either the telephone network or the Internet is illegal under the Wire Act.

Our bill has now been joined with Mr. LEACH's measure, which inhibits financial transactions arising from Internet gambling. This bill is needed. It effectively attacks the growing problem of offshore gambling. It attacks the money laundering that often attends these activities. It strengthens the ability of States to prohibit or to allow gambling transactions as they desire within their borders.

It will enable States to enforce their own laws. I want to commend Mr. GOODLATTE and Mr. LEACH for their careful work on this measure. I am pleased to urge its adoption by the House.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, no one has worked harder on this bill than the gentlewoman from Nevada (Ms. BERKLEY), and I yield her 4 minutes.

Ms. BERKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank Mr. CONYERS for his extraordinary efforts on this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this legislation. Despite the misinformed and misguided claims of this bill's supporters, it would neither prohibit Internet gaming nor increase enforcement capabilities of the United States Government.

Instead, passing this bill will do the exact opposite. The millions of Americans who currently wager online will continue to use offshore Web sites out of the reach of U.S. law enforcement, and they will remain unprotected by State regulators who ensure the integrity of brick and mortar gaming establishments in this country.

I continue to be astounded by the Members of this body who constantly rail against an intrusive Federal Government; and yet when it comes to gaming, they are the first, the first to call for government intrusion.

A man's home is his castle unless he chooses to participate in online gaming. Then his home is the province of the Federal Government. This bill was recently included on the House Republicans' American Values Agenda.

Which American values is this promoting? It certainly cannot be the right to privacy. It certainly cannot be the right of individuals to be free to make their own decisions about what type of recreation to enjoy. And, yes, my colleagues, gaming is considered a form of recreation for millions of our fellow citizens.

Gaming is legal in this country in those States who choose to allow it and to regulate it. The vast majority of States do allow gaming and regulate it, whether it be lotteries, racing, card rooms, casinos, or bingo. This bill would make a legal activity illegal in those same States solely because it is done online rather than in a casino or in a church. In reality, the intent of this bill, and it is rather obvious, is to attack and outlaw legal gaming in our Nation.

Supporters of this bill argue that online gaming is a great danger to society and our youth because some people gamble too much and some underage people might access online wagering sites. By that logic, the next piece of legislation we should be considering is banning online shopping. Surely those who overspend their budgets online and young people who borrow their mom's credit card must be stopped by the long arm of Federal law enforcement.

Supporters of the bill before us today claim that their target is the offshore gambling operations that are sucking

billions of dollars out of the United States, as Mr. GOODLATTE said. Indeed, Internet gaming has grown from a \$3 billion industry in 2001, and it is projected to reach \$25 billion by the end of the decade.

Americans account for as much as half of that amount. But there is nothing in this bill, let me repeat that, nothing in this bill that will shut down these offshore companies who operate legally in other countries. Like it or not, Americans who wish to wager online will find a way to do so.

The very nature of a free World Wide Web will continue to make online gaming available across the globe, including the United States. Under this bill, billions of dollars will continue to flow out of our country, with millions of Americans wishing to wager online. It is ridiculous, ridiculous to think this bill will actually stop online gaming. Just like Prohibition failed, this prohibition on gaming in the comfort of your own living room will fail as well.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MEEHAN).

Mr. MEEHAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this important bill to stop Internet gambling. Mr. Speaker, I do not have a problem with gambling; but the fact is that the Internet has grown, and gambling on the Internet has exploded. In 1995 the first online gambling site was born.

By 1999, that number had grown to 100 sites. Today there are more than 2,300 gambling Web sites. This increase in availability has mirrored an explosion in the amount of money spent on online gambling. In 1999, online gambling revenues were estimated at \$1 billion. By 2002 that number had tripled to \$3 billion. Today that number has quadrupled to \$12 billion.

Within those \$12 billion are stories of families that are finally ruined, and children that are addicted to gambling. We take this drastic action today because the problem of Internet gambling is so unique. Because it is so accessible and unregulated, Internet gambling is marketed to minors.

Now, I have been a leader in this institution in trying to prevent cigarette sales on the Internet. Why? Because if you go to try to purchase cigarettes at a convenience store, you have to demonstrate you are an adult or 18 years of age. When children can buy cigarettes on the Internet, they are able to get access. Young people, it is the same way with gambling. They cannot get in to brick and mortar casinos, but they can get onto a computer.

Because Internet gambling does not know borders or boundaries, it does not recognize State law, or any law for that matter. That is one of the reasons why 48 State attorneys general support the action that this Congress is taking today. Congress has a unique opportunity today to pass a strong anti-Internet gambling bill.

This bill does not do anything to affect legitimate gambling that is going

on in brick and mortar establishments. But the fact of the matter is when you allow unlimited, unregulated gambling, particularly in a country where States rely on gambling for revenues, but we see little money being spent on dealing with those people who have a problem, an addiction with gambling that has ruined literally thousands and thousands of lives across this country, we need to deal with this.

I urge my colleagues to vote for this bill and put the brakes on Internet gambling.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 15 seconds.

Mr. Speaker, I want to just let me dear friend from Massachusetts know that this bill requires no age verification for minors to place horse racing bets.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. PORTER).

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from Michigan. In all fairness to my friends and colleagues on this side of the aisle, I respectfully disagree with the concept.

Whether you are for or against Internet gaming, this bill is not going to change some realities. The reality, as has been mentioned here time and time again is close to \$12 billion is being invested on the Internet. We are not sure who these folks are, but we know the bulk of them are somewhere in other parts of the world.

I would highly encourage that my colleagues in the House look seriously at my bill, which is H.R. 5474, that I cosponsored with SHELLEY BERKLEY from Nevada, my friend and colleague. It is an Internet gambling study. It is a comprehensive study that looks at government activities, existing legal frameworks. There is so much confusion for those that are using the Internet. I would highly encourage, this is a very complex issue that needs intense review in a bipartisan approach. We are not going to stop Internet gambling. It is illegal today. This bill is one more piece that is not going to be enforced. I encourage opposition to this bill.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of the time.

Mr. Speaker and ladies and gentlemen, H.R. 4411 is Abramoff's revenge. If he were still lobbying and not on the way to imprisonment, he and his former client would have no reason to panic about H.R. 4411, because that bill contains the loophole for State lotteries that he was hired to secure in 2000, which is why he opposed the bill then. And now that he has got it, he would be in support of the bill.

The supporters often note the defeat of his bill in 2000, and his role in that defeat, as the reason to enact this year's bill. Wrong. However, the supporters conspicuously fail to note that Abramoff's goal was to preserve the ability of his then clients to bring State lotteries onto the Internet. He only worked to defeat the Goodlatte bill when it was clear that State lotteries would not be exempt from the

ban. He would be able and is able to rest easy today because we contain in this measure an amendment to the Wire Act that would allow States to sell lottery tickets online so long as certain minimal conditions are met, that is, that the State must specifically authorize online ticket sales.

Please, let's be real. Let's be candid. Let's be honest with the American people about what they were doing.

□ 1315

If we didn't have this loophole as big as a barn door, this bill would be a lot better off. And so H.R. 4411 is Abramoff's revenge. It is a bill that he could have supported in 2000. And though the passage of this bill is rationalized as a way to exorcise the demons of 2000 from the House, the reality is this bill serves his clients' interests. Please oppose this measure unless there are some changes made about it.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, it puzzles me greatly to hear my distinguished friend from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS) call this bill Abramoff's revenge. There are no two Members of this body that fought Mr. Abramoff more strongly on this issue than the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. LEACH) and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE). And what side are they on? They are the sponsors of this bill, because they realize that we have to do something to curtail Internet gambling.

Now, this bill started out before I became the chairman of the Judiciary Committee. It is still around, and Internet gambling is growing by leaps and bounds.

Now, I think that they have struck a good compromise, they have struck a good balance, and they have come up with legislation that is practical not only in attempting to deal with the methods of payment for debts accrued through Internet gambling, but also through an amendment of the Wire Act to deal with this issue, since most transmissions over the Internet no longer even touch the public wire telephone and telecommunications system.

I think that they have done a good job in coming up with something that can be passed by both Houses and signed into law; and the executive office of the President and the Office of Management and Budget issued a statement of administration policy saying that the administration supports passage of this bill.

How come everybody who has been fighting for this issue, or almost everybody who has been fighting for this issue, wants to have the bill passed, and we see some folks from Nevada and elsewhere that don't? Vote "aye" on the bill.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I support this legislation. It protects families and upholds the rule of law.

Any gambling not currently regulated by the states is illegal in this country. To avoid such regulation, gambling organizations have established themselves offshore and have put their businesses on the World Wide Web.

And the Internet has given anyone who knows how to use a computer—including children—access to unlimited gambling.

Unfortunately, illegal gambling businesses are rarely prosecuted. These 24-hour-a-day businesses entice children and adults and can lead to addiction, criminal behavior, financial troubles, and worse.

What these Internet sites do impacts every American. Also, officials from the FBI recently testified that Internet gambling serves as a vehicle for money laundering activities by terrorists.

The Internet Gambling Prohibition and Enforcement Act simply updates current law to make sure that all methods of gambling, even those done using the latest and ever-changing technologies, are covered under the established law known as the Wire Act.

The bill does this while at the same time ensuring that a State has the right to regulate gambling that happens solely within that State's borders.

And H.R. 4411 marginalizes organized gambling by banning those businesses from taking checks, wire transfers, and credit cards in payment for illegal gambling.

Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. GOODLATTE and Mr. LEACH for offering this legislation, and I urge my colleagues to support the bill.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 4411, of which I am a cosponsor. This legislation would prohibit banks and credit card companies from processing payments for online bets.

I believe gambling is inherently dishonest and am opposed to it in any form. During my 14 years in the State legislature I voted against every gambling bill we considered.

Gambling financially cripples those who can least afford it—the poor—through the cruel and misleading lure of "winning it big."

I am concerned about the spread of gambling, especially among our children. We need to pause and rethink whether we truly want to legalize so many forms of gambling in so many areas of the country.

In my judgment, Internet gambling should be regulated the same way as traditional forms of gambling, as was recommended by the National Gambling Impact Study Commission.

Illegal acts should be prohibited wherever they occur—including cyberspace—and society clearly has the right to prevent cyberspace from being used for illegal purposes. I urge my colleagues to support this important legislation.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I supported H.R. 2143, the Unlawful Internet Gambling Funding Prohibition Act, which passed the House by an overwhelming 319-104 vote in 2003. I also voted in favor of H.R. 3125, the Internet Gambling Prohibition Act, in 2000. I supported reforming Internet gambling then, and I am pleased that Congress has decided to take up this issue again today.

Current regulations on Internet gambling are out of date and ineffective. Forty-eight State Attorneys General have already written to Congress asking for Federal Internet gambling legislation, and many sports organizations have echoed their support. Although States

have passed laws attempting to stem the tide against Internet gambling, it continues to occur with greater frequency, with more and more Web sites being created daily that explicitly target our children. These sites not only take advantage of young Americans who have no means to pay their debts, but also encourage a dangerous, and possibly lifelong, addiction. Equally problematic, online gambling also serves as a tool for criminals to launder money and evade taxes. We must ensure that this stream of funding is closed to those who seek to do harm to the United States.

While it is essential to protect an individual's right to engage in legal and honest gaming, I also believe we have a duty to protect the public from abusive and fraudulent websites that take advantage of minors and exploit the system for their own gain. H.R. 4411 walks the fine line between these goals and provides law enforcement with the tools it needs to aggressively crack down on illegal gambling. I support this legislation and am pleased at its passage through the U.S. House of Representatives.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. BERKLEY

Ms. BERKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LATHAM). The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment printed in House Report 109-551 offered by Ms. BERKLEY:

Page 13, strike line 12 and all that follows through line 18 on page 15.

Redesignate succeeding subsections accordingly.

Page 21, strike lines 21 through 23.

Redesignate succeeding subsections accordingly.

Strike section 106.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 907, the gentlewoman from Nevada (Ms. BERKLEY) and the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER) each will control 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Nevada.

Ms. BERKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join the ranking member of the Judiciary Committee, Mr. CONYERS, and my colleague from Florida, Mr. WEXLER, in offering this amendment.

Despite all the righteous indignation we are hearing about the supposed evils of Internet gaming, this bill specifically and brazenly exempts one giant gambling enterprise from its prohibition. This bill's advocates proclaim the immorality of online gaming and shout that it will destroy our society unless you are betting on horse races.

Mr. GOODLATTE asserts that his bill is neutral on the subject of interstate online pari-mutuel betting, but there is no getting around the fact that this bill very clearly and specifically states that online betting on horse racing is not prohibited.

And if you don't believe me, Mr. Speaker, let's look at what the National Thoroughbred Racing Associa-

tion has said about the bill. In March of this year, after Financial Services approved the Leach bill, the NTRA issued a press release saying, "The National Thoroughbred Racing Association has secured language in the unlawful Internet Gambling Enforcement Act to protect Internet and account wagering on horse races."

Later in the same release, "The NTRA worked with Congressman GOODLATTE to ensure that H.R. 4777 also contained language that protects online and account pari-mutuel wagering." That sounds pretty clear to me.

But wait, Mr. Speaker, there is more. After the Judiciary Committee approved both the Goodlatte and Leach bills in May, the Thoroughbred Times published an article titled, "Gambling Bill Passes Committee With Racing Exemption Intact." The article states that the bill includes an exemption that would allow the United States horse racing industry to continue to conduct interstate account and Internet wagering. And, finally, it includes a quote from the NTRA spokesman who said, "Not only did the bill pass by a significant margin, but three separate amendments to either slip out or substantially limit our exception were all defeated." It sounds to me like they think they got an exception in this bill.

The bill also includes another hypothetical exemption for intrastate lotteries that is highly ironic because, as has been stated here before, this exemption is exactly what the notorious felon, Jack Abramoff, wanted when he reportedly orchestrated the defeat of a similar bill several years ago because it had no exemption for lotteries. Mr. Abramoff, if he were here, would be laughing about this turn of events. I am sure his former clients are giddy.

Our amendment would strike the horse racing and lottery exemptions from this bill. Members who say they dislike Internet gaming have the opportunity to prove it by supporting this amendment.

If we do not adopt the amendment, then this entire debate is a farce, Mr. Speaker, because the Internet Gambling Prohibition and Enforcement Act before us does not completely prohibit Internet gaming. You want to outlaw Internet gaming? This body wants to outlaw Internet gaming? Well, let's do it. Let's test the mettle of our fellow colleagues.

I have heard many speakers talk about the special interests involved in this bill. Well, it seems to me that the most special interest is the Thoroughbred Horse Racing Association. They seem to have the most clout because they are the ones that got the exemption.

I ask all of my colleagues to join with me. If you are serious about outlawing Internet gaming, then let's really do it, and let's not carve out an exemption because it suits your purposes and your special interests.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to the amendment. This amendment impairs States' rights to regulate gambling within their borders and eliminates the protection in this legislation that prevents gambling from crossing State lines.

Now, what State has got the most gambling to export? I believe it is the State of the author of this amendment, the gentlewoman from Nevada. Congress has consistently found that States have the primary responsibility for determining what forms of gambling may legally take place within their borders, and this amendment infringes on that right and subverts this principle. Forty-nine of the 50 State attorneys general support a ban on Internet gambling. Guess which attorney general doesn't. It is the attorney general from Nevada, the same State as the sponsor of this amendment, my distinguished colleague the gentlewoman from Nevada (Ms. BERKLEY).

And, unlike previous versions of the Internet gambling bills, H.R. 4411 is neutral as it relates to the Interstate Horse Racing Act. The relevant provision in the legislation simply states that, if an activity is permitted under the Interstate Horse Racing Act, it would not be prohibited by this legislation. If someone wants to amend the Interstate Horse Racing Act, let them introduce a bill to do so and it will be considered by the Congress.

It has been the Justice Department's position that the existing Wire Act covers gambling on interstate horse racing. So what is the beef? If the Wire Act already covers it, then this bill does not touch what the Wire Act covers. The amendment is nothing less than a poison pill to this crucial legislation. I urge my colleagues to oppose the amendment.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. BERKLEY. I would like to yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS).

Mr. CONYERS. I thank the gentlewoman for her amendment and for yielding to me, because the same Internet gambling legislation Abramoff fought so hard to defeat on behalf of a client that helped States conduct lotteries over the Internet now includes an exemption to protect those lotteries; and she speaks to this point in this amendment that she and I and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. WEXLER) now present.

If you are really for doing what you say you want to do, then what is wrong with this amendment? If we want to prohibit Internet gambling, let's do it completely. Let's not try to continue to fool the public.

The Hill article that I quoted went on to point out that "in addition to exemption for lotteries, the measure also included language to protect interstate pari-mutuel betting on horse races." The existence of these latter carve-outs

have also been confirmed by members of the horse racing industry themselves.

The amendment that my colleagues and I join together to offer today merely seeks to prove, once and for all, that State lotteries and the horse racing industry are no better than any other form of Internet gambling.

And so I am proud to strongly urge my colleagues to support our amendment. Please support the amendment and an across-the-board ban for all forms of online gambling.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to Mr. GOODLATTE from Virginia.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this amendment. A lot has been said here today about motivations. Well, I won't talk about motivations, but I will talk about consequences of this legislation, of this amendment.

The gentlewoman from Las Vegas, who has here on the floor lauded the merits of gambling, or gaming as she calls it, now offers an amendment to make this bill that we have fought for 8 years tighter and tougher on gambling? I don't think so. I will tell you that this is all about undoing what was done before.

The gentleman from Michigan tells us that this is what Jack Abramoff would love to see. But this is exactly the same method that Jack Abramoff used to derail this bill 6 years ago and 5 years ago, by arguing that the legislation was not strong enough on prohibiting gambling, when he was representing gambling interests, a whole host of gambling interests, offshore interests, lottery interests, a whole host of gambling interests. And that is what is being attempted here today.

This, Mr. Speaker, is an amendment that is clearly a poison pill designed to derail this legislation. Regardless of the intentions in offering it, 48 of 50 State attorneys general have come out in support of a ban on Internet gambling. An amendment such as this that restricts the right of States to continue to permit gambling within their borders is nothing more than an attempt to derail the bill by undermining the support from the States. That provision was in the previous versions of the bill; that provision is in this bill today, only it is even tighter.

The States have always had the right to allow or prohibit gambling within their borders. H.R. 4411 continues to ensure that States have that right, while imposing strict safeguards to ensure that the activity stays within State borders and does not extend to other States. These safeguards include requiring that the bettor, the gambling business, and any entity acting with a gambling business to process the bets and wagers all be physically located within the authorizing State, and that age and residence requirements are effective and in place.

□ 1330

Everyone knows that there is no technology that enables that to be

done on the Internet and, therefore, there is no exception on this legislation for lotteries or any other form of State gambling on the Internet.

Furthermore, H.R. 4411 gives new authority to State and Federal law enforcement to enforce the provisions of this bill to ensure that States comply with the safeguards established in the bill and that the law is enforced to the greatest extent possible.

The Berkley-Conyers-Wexler amendment would limit what a State can do exclusively within its borders and infringes on the rights of the States that have always had the opportunity to create and enforce their own gambling laws.

This amendment also deletes crucial language in the bill supported by the Department of Justice and the horse racing industry that maintains neutrality with respect to the Intrastate Horse Racing Act, a separate Federal statute that is not a part of this legislation unless you allow the supporters of this amendment to inject it into this bill.

This amendment is nothing more than a poison pill that would kill this strong bipartisan legislation, and I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on the Berkley amendment.

Ms. BERKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I absolutely am flabbergasted by the righteous indignation being displayed on the other side of the aisle, and it shocks my conscience hearing what I am hearing.

If the gentleman from Virginia is so intent on banning Internet gaming, well, then he should be supporting my amendment. Better yet, I should not have had to introduce an amendment. It should have been included in his original legislation.

If we are serious about banning gaming, then we should ban all forms of gaming, and I can't possibly imagine why he would be opposed to that. When he says it is a poison pill, why, because the horse racing association told him they would fight this if he brought in legislation that had this included and didn't make an exemption out of it?

I am absolutely astounded also by the other gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF), whom I don't think would be offended if I said that he was opposed to gaming of any form. But I find it incomprehensible that in the year 2000 Congress approved a provision allowing online betting on horse racing, and during consideration of the bill on the floor, Mr. WOLF made a statement in which he said, "This provision deeply troubles me, and would expand gambling at a time when men and women are becoming addicted to this process." Now he seems to be okay with the Leach-Goodlatte amendment which specifically exempts the activity made legal by this 2000 provision.

Now, if we want to let the States retain control of this issue, we should not be voting on doing this bill at all. It makes no sense. I would say that we

are interfering with the States' rights, not helping them out.

And if you are arguing that the bill is neutral on horse racing, then why is it even mentioned in this bill? And why does the Thoroughbred Horse Racing Association think they have an exemption? Is Mr. GOODLATTE willing to stand up here and make a statement for the record that the Thoroughbred Horse Racing Association and horse racing is exempt and the Department of Justice can go after them and shut them down? I don't think so.

And if you had an opportunity to go online, as I did just yesterday, and looked at the horse racing Internet sites, it is page after page after page. Anybody can log on. Anybody can place a bet. And I don't see any way to prevent children, and I don't see any way of keeping people from spending their hard-earned money on that.

This creates a huge exemption which we will have no control of, and totally, in my opinion, undermines the bill and makes a mockery and a farce of what we are doing here today, or supposed to be doing here today.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, to demonstrate that all of the opposition to the amendment doesn't come from this side of the aisle, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BOUCHER), a very loyal Democrat.

(Mr. BOUCHER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BOUCHER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin for yielding to me, and I do rise in opposition to this amendment.

The underlying bill contains a carefully negotiated balance which reflects existing laws that allow States to control gambling activities within their borders. The gentlewoman's amendment strikes that carefully negotiated balance. Its adoption would doom the bill. To those who support passage of the bill and a ban on Internet gambling, I urge a "no" vote on this amendment.

Forty-eight of 50 State attorneys general have announced support for a ban on Internet gambling. But if the amendment that is offered by the gentlewoman passes and States lose the authority over gambling within their borders, the bill will fail because State support for it will be withdrawn.

The bill is very clear on what authorities States will retain. States have traditionally been empowered to prohibit or allow gambling within their borders. The bill continues to give States that right while imposing strict safeguards to assure that gambling stays within a State's border and does not extend to other States.

Those safeguards require that the bettor, the business conducting the gambling operation, any services that support the wagerers and other support services must be in the authorizing

State. Horse racing would continue to be governed by existing Federal law, and that is the Intrastate Horse Racing Act that has been on the books now for almost 30 years.

Mr. GOODLATTE's bill strikes a careful balance that respects States' rights and existing law. Don't upset that balance. Defeat this amendment and allow the bill that bans Internet gambling to pass.

Ms. BERKLEY. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to how much time we have left?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from Nevada has 1½ minutes, and the gentleman from Wisconsin has 2½ minutes.

Ms. BERKLEY. I yield 45 seconds to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS).

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding to me yet again, but I have something that I will ask unanimous consent to put into the RECORD.

"Horse racing is betting on Internet wagering. Maryland industry chief DeFrancis says it could attract youth."

Now, maybe they don't understand their business as well as some of you here do, who think that they are mistaken when they think they have an exemption.

"Horse racing's problem is obvious: A decade's-long slump in attendance and wagering at the track. Horse racing's solution might be less obvious: Get people to stay home and bet."

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the article be included in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

[From the Baltimore Sun, May 15, 2006]

HORSE RACING IS BETTING ON INTERNET
WAGERING

(By Bill Ordine)

Horse racing's problem is obvious: a decades-long slump in attendance and wagering at the track.

Horse racing's solution might be less obvious: Get people to stay home—and bet.

In a seemingly paradoxical and counterintuitive turn, online technology, which would appear to discourage going to the races, is being viewed as a potential lifesaver for a sport on life support.

"Over the 25 years I've been in this industry, not one day has gone by when I haven't heard people complaining that our customer base is getting older and we can't attract young people," said Joseph A. De Francis, chief executive officer of the Maryland Jockey Club and executive vice president for operations of interactive betting channels for parent Magna Entertainment Corp. "And this gives us an opportunity to expand into the youth market unlike any we've ever had before."

When the 131st Preakness Stakes is run Saturday at Pimlico Race Course in Baltimore, advanced-deposit wagering—the broader category of which online betting forms the greatest share—is expected to make up a growing portion of the bottom line. So-called ADW handle, meaning the money wagered, comes from bettors using telephones and

other interactive devices as well as computers.

Last year, ADW handle accounted for \$39 million, or nearly 8 percent of the total for racing at Pimlico and Laurel Park, according to the Maryland Jockey Club, which runs the tracks. Nationally, of the \$14.6 billion wagered on horse racing in 2005, approximately 88 percent was off-track, and ADW handle was about \$1.16 billion, according to data published by the Oregon Racing Commission.

During this year's Kentucky Derby Day, Youbet.com—the largest provider of Internet racing content in the country—processed nearly \$5.6 million in wagers, a 34 percent increase over 2005.

Horse racing and online wagering officials say the near-term consequence of online betting is an increase in the racing industry's overall handle. But just as important, they contend, is that in the long run, people who are introduced to horse racing via the computer will be enticed to see the real thing more often.

Racing hopes to follow the lead of poker, where card-playing Web sites, along with televised tournaments, inspired a rejuvenation of poker playing at brick-and-mortar casinos.

"If you find a shoe that fits—steal it," said Youbet.com CEO Chuck Champion. A publicly traded company based in California, Youbet.com handled about \$395 million in wagers last year, according to the company's annual report. Youbet.com's business plan calls for the company to retain 6 percent of the handle, and tens of millions of dollars were passed on to the racing industry last year.

Champion said a number of strategies employed by offshore gambling sites, which often include betting opportunities beyond horse racing, such as team sports and casino games, provide other lessons. One is to offer a nongambling version of a Web site (usually designated as a .net rather than a .com) to educate the public with tutorials and play-money games. Such Web sites also allow operators to get around federal bans on advertising for Internet gambling, especially on television.

Youbet.com has introduced such a .net version.

"Our sport is harder to understand than poker," Champion said, referring to the nuances of handicapping.

De Francis, who oversees Magna Entertainment's similar Web site, XpressBet, said people unfamiliar with poker usually would be too intimidated to play in a casino, but the online playing experience gives them the confidence to try the real thing.

"I've seen people come to the track—you'll see them at the Preakness next Saturday—and these are smart people, but they're not regulars, and they don't know what to do. They don't know what an exacta is, what across-the-board means, what a furlong is—and they don't want to look foolish," De Francis said. "If they learn about these things online in their home, then we may have new fans."

Some are not convinced that online bettors will become regular railbirds.

Hall of Fame trainer D. Wayne Lukas, a spokesman for Youbet.com, is sold on the benefits of online wagering for his industry but wonders about its impact at the track.

"We thought simulcasting would help with attendance, and I'm not sure that happened," he said. But he said online wagering is a necessary adaptation.

"We always worry about handle, but there's also the issue of a fan base that we have to grow," he said. "I had always said that people relate to the horses. But now, the thing that young people relate to is the technology."

And technology is what drives online horse wagering. The most sophisticated Web sites offer a menu of entertainment and information choices. A Web visitor can view the racing charts for dozens of racetracks, watch the races—both live and on replay—and wager on the outcomes.

"As we head toward what technology people call convergence between the computer and the TV, what we have at the end of the line is a product that appears to be ideally tailored for horse racing," De Francis said. "Where someone goes online, and with a high-resolution LCD screen, can see the post parade and get all the information needed to make an informed wager."

Still, there are obstacles posed by legal complexities at home and by illegal (in the United States) competitors offshore.

While the horse racing industry contends that federal legislation enacted in 1978 and amended in 2001 gives the green light to online wagering in states where it is legal, the Department of Justice holds that pre-existing statutes make the practice unlawful.

Last month, a Justice Department lawyer told a congressional subcommittee that the department is undertaking a civil investigation of a potential violation of law on interstate horse betting.

A department spokesman said there have been no prosecutions involving horse racing advanced deposit wagering operators.

Web sites also have varying approaches for individual states. For instance, Youbet.com will accept wagers from bettors who live in all but 11 states. TVG.com, owned by publicly traded Gemstar-TV Guide International, takes wagers from bettors in only 12 states. Both take bets from Maryland residents.

And there is formidable competition from offshore Internet sites that generally operate without U.S. legal constraints. One of the most popular, Bodog.com, which has a marketing partnership with Preakness-bound Brother Derek's racing team, reported in a news release a 100 percent year-over-year growth in betting volume for the Kentucky Derby without being specific about the figures.

De Francis concedes that offshore Web sites are "killing" the onshore competition because they offer rebates, give bettors the chance to gamble on other sports and extend credit. And little of the millions made offshore finds its way to the racing industry.

Still, he considers regulated online wagering important for horse racing.

"It's really the future," De Francis said. "When you look at the [wagering] numbers, you see us going from zero to something that's beginning to be significant. And if you plot that curve, there's no telling where the numbers will be in 10 years."

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF).

Mr. WOLF. I thank the gentleman.

I rise in strong opposition to the amendment. It will gut the bill. If you want to kill this bill, hurt this bill, this amendment will do it. This is a poison pill. Mr. GOODLATTE was right. God bless Mr. GOODLATTE for staying in there. He is right.

Members have been manipulated in the past. The question is, and I think the answer is, this Congress is not made up of people who are so stupid and able to be manipulated, and so my sense is that this Congress, when given an opportunity, will not allow this outside lobbyist, the outside groups to manipulate it again.

I urge a “no” vote on the Conyers amendment and an “aye” vote and passage of the bill.

Ms. BERKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I have heard a lot today about a carefully negotiated balance in this bill. I would like to know who was involved in this negotiation. I certainly wasn't. Was the horsing racing industry involved? Apparently, they were. Talk about a special interest. The lotteries? Jack Abramoff, perhaps? Because they are all getting exactly what they want with this piece of legislation.

I would like to urge a little honesty on the floor today and urge my colleagues to support the Berkley-Conyers amendment. If you are serious about banning Internet gaming, well, then, let's ban it and let's not make a major exception that can drive a truck through this.

I urge all my colleagues, before you vote on this, go online. Check out horse racing online and see the pages and pages of online betting that you can do when it comes to racing horses. There is no excuse and no reason for this exemption other than you couldn't cut a deal with the horse racing industry, so you exempted them.

I urge everyone to vote for the Berkley amendment and against the Goodlatte bill.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, let's forget about who is on which side of this legislation and this amendment here in the House of Representatives, and let's look at the fact that 49 out of the 50 State attorneys general support this legislation. They are not in the back pocket of any industry. They are all elected, or most of them are elected by the people, and they are the chief law enforcement officers of their respective States. They say we need this legislation and they support this legislation and oppose the amendment.

The only State attorney general that doesn't is the State attorney general of Nevada. Now, which State has got the most gambling to export across State lines into other States? I would submit it is Nevada. Which State doesn't have horse racing and doesn't have a State lottery to export? It is Nevada, among others.

So I give the gentlewoman from Nevada a lot of credit for representing her State and her constituents. I don't think that is the priority of the other 49 States. It certainly is not the priority of their State attorneys general, and we ought to vote down this amendment.

Mr. SWEENEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to day in opposition of the Berkley amendment. This amendment would outlaw all gambling online throughout the United States. This is unnecessary and would hurt the domestic horseracing industry. The domestic horseracing industry is already regulated. This amendment would put unnecessary burdens on an industry that operates above board.

A provision allowing for legal horse gambling domestically and opening the door to allow horse gambling over the Internet is included in this bill. Regulated by States though the Interstate Horseracing Act, IHA, this provision was agreed to by the Justice Department and the domestic horseracing industry.

The primary focus of H.R. 4411 is to curb illegal—primarily offshore—wagering, not regulate further the domestic horse industry. We need to allow the States to continue regulating horseracing via State racing commissions or legislatures.

Currently, ongoing discussions are occurring between Justice Department and the horseracing industry concerning horse race gambling over the Internet. The Berkley amendment would prevent this review from continuing.

The horseracing industry is a massive economic engine in our Nation, providing \$26 billion in economic activity and maintaining over 1 million jobs. In my district alone, which is home to the Saratoga Racetrack, the oldest thoroughbred track in the country, the horseracing industry brings in over \$70 million into the local economy. If this amendment passes, hard-working individuals would certainly lose their jobs. The industry sustains more than 40,000 people across my home State of New York, over 10,000 in my district.

The industry supports a large sector of small businesses and is the reason for the existence of more than 400 New York State breeding farms. During the 2005 season alone, the Saratoga Racetrack attracted 1 million people, who wagered approximately \$145 million. That equates to 1 million people in Saratoga spending \$70 million at local restaurants, stores and various other attractions. These people make Saratoga the jewel of upstate New York that it is. We ought not to punish a legitimate industry that is already regulated.

This is a responsible industry that provides jobs, pumps money into our economy and is already regulated. I urge a “no” vote on this amendment.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 907, the previous question is ordered on the bill, as amended, and on the further amendment by the gentlewoman from Nevada (Ms. BERKLEY).

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Nevada (Ms. BERKLEY).

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

Ms. BERKLEY. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, further consideration of H.R. 4411 will be postponed.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on motions to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote is objected to under clause 6 of rule XX.

Record votes on postponed questions will be taken tomorrow.

TO STUDY AND PROMOTE THE USE OF ENERGY EFFICIENT COMPUTER SERVERS IN THE UNITED STATES

Mr. ROGERS of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5646) to study and promote the use of energy efficient computer servers in the United States, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 5646

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. STUDY.

Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, through the Energy Star program, shall transmit to the Congress the results of a study analyzing the rapid growth and energy consumption of computer data centers by the Federal Government and private enterprise. The study shall include—

(1) an overview of the growth trends associated with data centers and the utilization of servers in the Federal Government and private sector;

(2) analysis of the industry migration to the use of energy efficient microchips and servers designed to provide energy efficient computing and reduce the costs associated with constructing, operating, and maintaining large and medium scale data centers;

(3) analysis of the potential cost savings to the Federal Government, large institutional data center operators, private enterprise, and consumers available through the adoption of energy efficient data centers and servers;

(4) analysis of the potential cost savings and benefits to the energy supply chain through the adoption of energy efficient data centers and servers, including reduced demand, enhanced capacity, and reduced strain on existing grid infrastructure, and consideration of secondary benefits, including potential impact of related advantages associated with substantial domestic energy savings;

(5) analysis of the potential impacts of energy efficiency on product performance, including computing functionality, reliability, speed, and features, and overall cost;

(6) analysis of the potential cost savings and benefits to the energy supply chain through the use of stationary fuel cells for backup power and distributed generation;

(7) an overview of current government incentives offered for energy efficient products and services and consideration of similar incentives to encourage the adoption of energy efficient data centers and servers;

(8) recommendations regarding potential incentives and voluntary programs that could be used to advance the adoption of energy efficient data centers and computing; and

(9) a meaningful opportunity for interested stakeholders, including affected industry

stakeholders and energy efficiency advocates, to provide comments, data, and other information on the scope, contents, and conclusions of the study.

SEC. 2. SENSE OF CONGRESS.

It is the sense of Congress that it is in the best interest of the United States for purchasers of computer servers to give high priority to energy efficiency as a factor in determining best value and performance for purchases of computer servers.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. ROGERS) and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BOUCHER) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ROGERS of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on this legislation and to insert extraneous material on the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the digital economy is on the move, and we have got some great news for Michigan, a State that is very automotive dominated, with Google announcing 1,000 jobs over the next 5 years this morning to be located right outside my district in Ann Arbor, Michigan. This is a great and important, I think, announcement for our State, which has had a little bit of economic trouble, but is now embracing this new wave of digital innovation, the digital economy, the IT economy, as it spreads around this great country.

With that come some serious concerns for the IT community, for those who are involved in the digital economy, and for those of us, all of us, who depend on energy use.

According to industry analysts, the U.S. server market is expected to grow from 2.8 million units in 2005 to 4.9 million units in 2009, a growth rate, Mr. Speaker, of almost 50 percent. Data center energy costs are expected to soar, as companies deploy greater numbers of servers consuming more power and, in the process, emitting more heat that needs to be dissipated.

□ 1345

Data center electricity costs are already in the range of \$3.3 billion annually. Improved energy savings in servers will help the United States meet its energy demands to stay competitive in the global economy without having to build new generating facilities. If done right, Mr. Speaker, that is power lines that won't have to be built, it is power plants that won't have to be built just to meet the demands of what is a growing part of our economy, and that is these data centers as applies to the IT or digital economy.

Interesting, if you take a small 100,000 square foot, which is not so

small, actually, annual utility cost for a data center or a server farm, it is nearly \$6 million. If done right, efficient servers can result in as high as an 80 percent reduction in electricity demand. That is \$4.8 million in savings if we can reach that goal. That means jobs, innovation, expansion. It means taking the money and investing it in people versus electricity or energy costs. That is a win for everybody.

Mr. Speaker, this is a commonsense conservation bill that will work to reduce the need for new power plants and new transmission lines in each of our districts by driving down demand for electricity and allowing the expansion and growth of the digital economy.

There are a great number of organizations who have stepped up to support H.R. 5646, and I would like to name just a few: the Alliance to Save Energy, American Electronics Association, American Council for an Energy Efficient Economy, Electronic Industries Alliance, Information Technology Industry Council, Semiconductor Industry Association, and TechNet.

The legislation is very straightforward. It calls for a study in our ability to get ahead of this very, very important problem looming before us, and that is the expanded use of energy.

Finally, I want to thank Ms. ESHOO for her help and support and assistance in this effort, as well as that of her staff, who have worked diligently with my staff to help put this together in a timely fashion to help meet the needs of this new and exciting American economy.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BOUCHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. BOUCHER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BOUCHER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 5646, a measure which will require the Environmental Protection Agency to conduct an analysis of the energy effects of the expanding use of computer servers and the concentration of computer servers in large data centers. Computer server use is rapidly growing at a rate that is estimated to be 50 percent over a mere 5 years. Servers are now used in virtually every business and every government office. And now companies with large information processing needs are aggregating servers into large data centers.

The growing use of servers has an energy consequence, and it is now estimated that server operations consume electricity valued at \$3 billion annually. In our ongoing efforts to become a more energy-efficient Nation, it is appropriate that we focus on ways to encourage more energy-efficient computer servers.

The Environmental Protection Agency and the Department of Energy are charged with the administration of the Energy Star program, which identifies and labels energy-efficient technologies in a number of business and

household products. Use of more energy-efficient products enables residential and commercial energy consumers to lower their electricity costs and also to lessen the overall national demand for electricity.

H.R. 5646 would facilitate and advance the ongoing efforts of the Environmental Protection Agency, of technology companies, and nongovernmental organizations to determine how best to measure the energy efficiency of data centers with the goal of identifying and labeling as an Energy Star product the most efficient computer server technologies.

This measure provides appropriate guidance to the EPA for use in conducting an analysis of the energy consumption of computer data centers, as well as for the identification of potential cost savings that could be achieved by identifying through the Energy Star program energy-efficient computer server systems for use in data centers.

I want to commend the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. ROGERS) and also the gentlewoman from California (Ms. ESHOO) for their careful and thorough work and for their creativity in bringing this innovative and very timely measure to the floor. It is my privilege, Mr. Speaker, to urge its passage by the House.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROGERS of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. ESHOO).

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague, Mr. ROGERS from the Energy and Commerce Committee, for the work he has done on this bill. I am proud to be the Democratic lead on it. I think it is a very important step for the Congress to take. Obviously, I urge all of my colleagues to vote for it.

The bill, as you have heard, directs the EPA to study the energy efficiency of computer servers and data centers within our government, the United States Government, as well as the private sector.

Data centers are facilities that house large amounts of electronic equipment, primarily computer servers that handle data for large and complex operations which continue to grow daily in our country.

These facilities can occupy an entire room, an entire floor, or an entire building. According to industry estimates, the average annual electricity cost of running a single data center is about \$6 million a year, and the cumulative energy costs for these centers is about \$3.3 billion a year. So the energy demands of these operations are going to continue to grow.

They are going to continue to expand as the market for servers is expected to expand by about 50 percent over the next 5 years. And of course the by-word of this Congress and I think future Congresses is going to be energy conservation, energy conservation, energy conservation.

The EPA, high-technology companies, and nongovernmental organizations have discussed how to measure efficiency of these data centers with an eye toward providing an Energy Star rating for the most efficient technology. It has worked with other industries. It really has been a motivator. Anyone who goes out to buy appliances for their home, you look for the energy-efficient label, and that has done much to conserve in our country.

I think the study that this bill calls for will advance this, as well as helping consumers, businesses, and the government to identify the most efficient technology to meet their needs.

The bill, H.R. 5646, has the support of high-technology companies, of environmental groups, of energy companies, including the Alliance to Save Energy, the AEA, TechNet, SIA, EIA, and the ITIC.

I want to thank Mr. ROGERS for accepting the changes that we suggested to the bill as reported by the Energy and Commerce Committee. I think the changes are going to ensure that the EPA will continue to seek input not only from industry stakeholders, but from environmental groups and outside efficiency experts.

We have also taken steps to ensure that the EPA examines the features and the capabilities of computer data centers in its report, and that the EPA has adequate time to prepare this study.

I thank Mr. ROGERS for working so hard to make sure this comes to the floor. I urge all of my colleagues to support it. This is a good bill. It is an important step.

Mr. BOUCHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. ZOE LOFGREN).

Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California. Mr. Speaker, along with my colleague, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. ESHOO), I represent Silicon Valley and we certainly know the need for this legislation in Silicon Valley. As Ms. ESHOO has indicated, this bill has the support of the high-tech sector, and for a very good reason.

According to a recent report, 41 percent of Fortune 500 IT executives identified power and cooling problems for their data centers. In my own district in San Jose, we had a server farm that wanted to go in. Everybody wanted it. We had to build a power plant to actually accommodate the server farm. We are looking for energy efficiencies in this sector.

We know that climate change threatens the security and stability of our planet and economy, and everything we can do to reduce power consumption and sustain energy independence is a good thing for our planet and for our society.

I would just note that we have come a long way since I was a youngster when computers took up a room and we had punch cards and the heat and power drag was incredible. If we can reduce power consumption, we can up ef-

iciency and production as well. This bill is a good step. The Energy Star program does not include this sector today, so this is an important step forward.

I hope that this measure will be supported by a wide margin in the House. There is no reason in the world that I can think of that any Member of this House should not vote for it. I commend Members on both sides of the aisle for their leadership in bringing this forward.

Mr. BOUCHER. Mr. Speaker, we have no further speakers at this time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ROGERS of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. ROGERS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5646, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds of those present have voted in the affirmative.

Mr. ROGERS of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

AMENDING PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE ACT WITH RESPECT TO NATIONAL FOUNDATION FOR THE CENTERS FOR DISEASE CONTROL AND PREVENTION

Mr. DEAL of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill (S. 655) to amend the Public Health Service Act with respect to the National Foundation for the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

S. 655

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. NATIONAL FOUNDATION FOR THE CENTERS FOR DISEASE CONTROL AND PREVENTION; ACCEPTANCE OF VOLUNTARY SERVICES; FEDERAL FUNDING.

(a) AUTHORITY FOR ACCEPTANCE OF VOLUNTARY SERVICES; STRIKING TWO-YEAR LIMIT PER INDIVIDUAL.—Section 399G(h)(2)(A) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 280e-11(h)(2)(A)) is amended by striking the second sentence and inserting the following: "In the case of an individual, such Director may accept the services provided under the preceding sentence by the individual until such time as the private funding for such individual ends."

(b) REPORTS.—Section 399G(h)(7) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 280e-11(h)(7)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A), by inserting "including an accounting of the use of amounts provided for under subsection (i)" before the period at the end of the second sentence; and

(2) by striking subparagraph (C) and inserting the following:

"(C) The Foundation shall make copies of each report submitted under subparagraph (A) available—

"(i) for public inspection, and shall upon request provide a copy of the report to any individual for a charge not to exceed the cost of providing the copy; and

"(ii) to the appropriate committees of Congress."

(c) FEDERAL FUNDING.—Section 399G(i) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 280e-11(i)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2)—

(A) in subparagraph (A), by striking "\$500,000", and inserting "\$1,250,000"; and

(B) in subparagraph (B), by striking "not more than \$500,000" and inserting "not less than \$500,000, and not more than \$1,250,000"; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

"(4) SUPPORT SERVICES.—The Director of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention may provide facilities, utilities, and support services to the Foundation if it is determined by the Director to be advantageous to the programs of such Centers."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. DEAL) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GENE GREEN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. DEAL of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on this legislation and to insert extraneous material on the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. DEAL of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of S. 655, legislation to make needed improvements to the CDC Foundation. The CDC Foundation is a private, non-profit foundation established by Congress in 1992 to help the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention fulfill its mission on protecting health and promoting safety. It is located in my State of Georgia. The CDC Foundation is a unique private-public partnership that supports the important work of the CDC both here in the United States and around the world.

When public health emergencies strike, the CDC Foundation harnesses the know-how of the private sector to fill the gaps and get around government red tape, helping to keep Americans safe from harm.

To fulfill its mission, the CDC Foundation relies heavily on the ingenuity and resources of private donations. In the 11 years since its incorporation, the CDC Foundation has raised more than \$100 million in private donations from individuals, corporate partners, and other foundations. With the relatively small Federal investment of half a million dollars per year for operating expenses, the CDC Foundation has been able to leverage over \$15 million per

year in private funds over the last 5 years. This represents an amazing 30-to-1 return on the Federal investment.

These funds allow the foundation to manage over 100 programs that work directly with the CDC and the United States in over 30 countries around the world.

□ 1400

The CDC Foundation helps to bring an international focus to the work of the CDC that is having a direct impact on the health of U.S. citizens here at home. When deadly infections like SARS or bird flu arise in distant parts of the world, the world-renowned expertise of CDC experts can play an important role in disease monitoring and prevention. Effective intervention at the source can stop these diseases in their tracks, preventing them from ever reaching our soil.

With help from the CDC Foundation, experts at the CDC train local public health officials from around the world, offering valuable resources and expertise to fight deadly infections and save lives.

But the CDC Foundation doesn't just protect Americans by supporting overseas activities. Here in the United States the Foundation gives CDC needed flexibility during public health emergencies. In the aftermath of Hurricane Katrina last year, for example, the lack of computers and Internet access was hampering the CDC's work in detecting and containing potential disease outbreaks among Houston-area hurricane evacuees. Thanks to the ready availability of CDC Foundation funds, these CDC teams were able to cut through the red tape and purchase the equipment they needed to get the job done.

Furthermore, the CDC Foundation is served by an outstanding internationally renowned board of directors that draws its members from the corporate, philanthropic, educational and public health sectors. These leaders have served ably in bringing about both accountability and flexibility to this unique public-private partnership. And I would urge the support of this legislation today.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I would like to thank Ranking Member DINGELL and our ranking member of the subcommittee, SHERROD BROWN, for allowing me to manage the bill.

I rise in support of this legislation which the Energy and Commerce Committee reported out last month. This legislation makes minor changes in the National Foundation for the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention so that it can have the flexibility it needs to build on its success to date.

First authorized by Congress in 1992, the CDC Foundation is an excellent example of a public-private partnership that can yield tremendous results with minimal taxpayer investment.

Specifically, the Foundation has utilized \$500,000 in Federal funding to bring in approximately \$15 million in private sector dollars each year. This amounts to a 30-to-1 return on CDC's annual investment in the Foundation.

With this funding, the CDC Foundation has implemented more than 100 health and safety programs in over 30 countries. These programs stretch across the world and reach all levels of society from corporate leaders and health care professionals to patients.

For example, the Foundation has addressed global health concerns with the Round Table on Global Health Threats, which brought global government and corporate leaders together to develop ways to better detect global health threats.

The Foundation has also been instrumental in the establishment of a health leadership academy that provides management training for midcareer health care professionals from local and State health departments.

The CDC Foundation has also improved the health of underserved women here at home through its mobile mammogram van. This partnership with Avon has put mobile vans on the ground in rural and underserved communities. There is no question that these vans have saved the lives of American women who face significant barriers to health care and whose cancer would have most likely gone undetected until it was too late.

What's more, the CDC has now assigned a scientist to the program to evaluate the program and determine the best practices for similar programs around the country.

This bill makes minor changes in the Foundation's authorization that will have a major impact on the Foundation's ability to leverage its resources and maximize the outcome. For example, the bill increases the authorization levels the CDC director can put toward the Foundation. This change will provide the CDC director with the flexibility to increase CDC's investment in the Foundation, but not at additional taxpayer expense, since the CDC's contribution to the Foundation is not appropriated, but comes from the director's budget.

The bill would also allow for better alignment of private fellowships and Foundation activities. Currently, fellows may be assigned to the Foundation program for 2 years, despite the program's duration of 3 to 4. This small change will allow fellows to remain throughout the program's duration, providing the program with invaluable institutional memory and increased efficiency, which will no doubt improve the outcomes.

This is a commonsense bill that will improve the public-private partnerships that are so important to the current success of the CDC Foundation.

I encourage my colleagues to join me in supporting this bill and ensure we build on this success in the future.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DEAL of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to my colleague from Georgia (Mr. LINDER), who is the sponsor of the House version of this same bill that we are now considering from the Senate.

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of House passage for S. 655 and I urge my colleagues on both sides to join me in supporting the measure.

S. 655 closely mirrors legislation I introduced in the House last year, H.R. 1569. Both of these measures seek the same objective, to make very few limited changes to current Federal law governing the National Foundation for the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.

In light of the fact that the U.S. Senate approved an amended version of S. 655 last July, I worked with my friend and colleague from Georgia (Mr. DEAL), the chairman of the Energy and Commerce Subcommittee on Health, to bring this measure to the floor today. I commend him for all of his work on this project, and express my appreciation for his support and leadership on health policy matters, including the CDC.

The legislation before us today, S. 655, would allow research fellows at the Foundation to remain in their positions for as long as their privately funded fellowships remain in effect. Currently, such fellowships must end after 2 years.

Second, the bill gives the director of the CDC authority to provide facilities, utilities and support services to the Foundation, provided that doing so furthers the CDC's public health mission.

Third, it would allow the Secretary of HHS, on behalf of the CDC, to make up to \$1.25 million in funding available to the Foundation each year, an increase from the current law level of \$500,000.

This bill passed the Senate by unanimous consent and has moved quickly through Energy and Commerce. The important part is the raising the funding part. For every dollar in public funds, the Foundation generates \$30 in nongovernmental funding from the private sector. For example, GlaxoSmithKline Biologicals paid \$30,000 for an Asian rotavirus surveillance network meeting.

Kaiser Foundation Hospitals gave \$2 million to emergency preparedness and the response fund.

Sanofi Pasteur paid \$1.5 million for a meningococcal vaccine study.

Wyeth Pharmaceuticals paid \$3 million for a study of the blood inhibitors in hemophilia patients. These were of parochial interest to these corporations, but of general interest to the public health, and have been helpful to all of us.

In short, the Foundation leverages a modest amount of public money and uses that to generate a large amount of private nongovernmental support for the CDC and its mission. Passing S. 655

will help enable the Foundation to surpass this exemplary record of achievement.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this bill.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DEAL of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to my other Georgia colleague, Mr. GINGREY.

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding. As I listened to my colleagues, I realized that a lot of what I am going to say is going to be a repeat, but I will tell you what, the story is so good, Mr. Speaker, I want to hear it again myself.

Let me just say that this legislation contains two crucial provisions that allow the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention more flexibility to expand its successful National Foundation Program.

This Foundation is a private, nonprofit organization that was authorized back in 1992 by Congress to raise private funds to support the work of the CDC. It was established to unite outside partners and resources with CDC scientists and employees in order to build programs which substantially strengthen the influence of the CDC.

Some examples of the Foundation's current successful partnerships are Home Depot, UPS and BellSouth.

Currently, the Foundation is required to enforce a maximum of 2 years' participation in the program. However, S. 655 would allow the Foundation to work with these and other partners and employees for as long as they deem appropriate.

Since it was incorporated as a nonprofit back in 1996, the National Foundation for the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention has raised, and it has been stated earlier, more than \$100 million. This has been accomplished with a maximum annual investment limit of only \$500,000, meaning that each year the CDC can transfer a maximum of 500,000 from its own budget to fund the Foundation.

In recent years, the Foundation has established a reputation of raising almost \$15 million annually. And that, as Mr. GREEN said, is a 30-fold return on investment.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation increases this maximum investment limit to \$1.25 million, an amount equal to the ceiling placed on the Foundation for the National Institutes of Health.

This provision allows the CDC to transfer an additional \$750,000 annually from its budget to support the operating expenses of the Foundation, thereby allowing it to continue to raise private funds for CDC research.

In this time of uncertainty with respect to things like avian flu and other public health threats, our country needs more from this agency than ever. S. 655 gives the Foundation the flexibility to make crucial changes that will increase the capacity of the CDC by leveraging this successful public-private sector collaboration.

It is in the best interest of the American taxpayer to allow a successful program to leverage more private funds to support this crucial agency. I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DEAL of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, the proposed legislation today, as has already been stated, has already received strong bipartisan support as it unanimously passed the Senate, and likewise, passed the Energy and Commerce Committee of the House.

The bill makes several changes to the existing CDC Foundation statute. For example, it allows greater sharing of resources such as private office space and facilities from the CDC to the Foundation. It also extends the lengths of fellowships granted by the Foundation beyond the current limit of 2 years.

The bill will allow the director of the CDC to shift more of her discretionary funding to cover the administrative and operating cost of the foundation. Like any nonprofit or charitable foundation, the CDC Foundation must cover its administrative costs out of its own funds. This legislation will allow the CDC director to provide the Foundation between \$500,000 per year up to the \$1.25 million per year for operating expenses, depending on need.

Finally, the bill provides additional accountability for Federal resources by requiring a report of the Foundation's activities to be submitted to Congress each year. With these improvements contained in this legislation, I am confident that the CDC Foundation will be able to attract additional significant private funds and expand its role in assisting the CDC.

The continuing partnership between the Foundation and the Federal Government is helping the CDC to have a positive impact on people's health in the United States and around the world.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the passage of this bill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KIRK). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. DEAL) that the House suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill, S. 655, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the Senate bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

INTERNET GAMBLING PROHIBITION AND ENFORCEMENT ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, proceedings will now resume on the bill, H.R. 4411.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. BERKLEY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the vote on the

amendment by the gentlewoman from Nevada (Ms. BERKLEY) on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The yeas and nays are ordered on the amendment.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 114, nays 297, not voting 21, as follows:

[Roll No. 361]

YEAS—114

Abercrombie	Eshoo	Michaud
Ackerman	Farr	Millender-
Andrews	Filner	McDonald
Baca	Ford	Moore (KS)
Baird	Gonzalez	Napolitano
Baldwin	Gordon	Obey
Barrow	Green, Al	Owens
Becerra	Grijalva	Pelosi
Berkley	Harman	Rangel
Berman	Hastings (FL)	Reyes
Bilirakis	Hayworth	Roybal-Allard
Bishop (NY)	Honda	Rush
Blumenauer	Inslee	Sánchez, Linda
Boren	Israel	T.
Brown (OH)	Jackson (IL)	Sanchez, Loretta
Brown, Corrine	Jackson-Lee	Sanders
Brown-Waite,	(TX)	Schakowsky
Ginny	Jefferson	Serrano
Butterfield	Johnson, E. B.	Shays
Capps	Kildee	Simmons
Carnahan	Kilpatrick (MI)	Solis
Carson	Kind	Spratt
Case	Kolbe	Stark
Clay	Kucinich	Stupak
Cleaver	Lantos	Thompson (CA)
Clyburn	Larsen (WA)	Thompson (MS)
Conyers	Larson (CT)	Towns
Cooper	Lee	Udall (CO)
Costello	Lewis (GA)	Udall (NM)
Davis (IL)	Lipinski	Velázquez
Davis (TN)	LoBiondo	Visclosky
Delahunt	Lofgren, Zoe	Watson
DeLauro	Lowey	Waxman
Dicks	Marshall	Weiner
Dingell	Matheson	Woolsey
Doggett	Matsui	Wu
Duncan	McCollum (MN)	Wynn
Edwards	McDermott	Young (AK)
Emanuel	McKinney	
Engel	Meeks (NY)	

NAYS—297

Aderholt	Camp (MI)	Ehlers
Akin	Campbell (CA)	Emerson
Alexander	Cannon	English (PA)
Allen	Cantor	Etheridge
Bachus	Capito	Everett
Baker	Capuano	Fattah
Barrett (SC)	Cardin	Feeney
Bartlett (MD)	Cardoza	Ferguson
Barton (TX)	Carter	Fitzpatrick (PA)
Bass	Castle	Flake
Bean	Chabot	Foley
Beauprez	Chandler	Fortenberry
Berry	Chocola	Fossella
Biggert	Coble	Fox
Blibray	Cole (OK)	Frank (MA)
Bishop (GA)	Conaway	Franks (AZ)
Bishop (UT)	Costa	Frelinghuysen
Blackburn	Cramer	Gallely
Blunt	Crenshaw	Garrett (NJ)
Boehlert	Crowley	Gerlach
Boehner	Cubin	Gibbons
Bonilla	Cuellar	Gilchrest
Bonner	Culberson	Gillmor
Bono	Cummings	Gingrey
Boozman	Davis (AL)	Gohmert
Boswell	Davis (CA)	Goode
Boucher	Davis (KY)	Goodlatte
Boustany	Davis, Tom	Granger
Boyd	Deal (GA)	Graves
Bradley (NH)	DeFazio	Green, Gene
Brady (PA)	DeGette	Gutknecht
Brady (TX)	Dent	Hall
Brown (SC)	Diaz-Balart, L.	Harris
Burgess	Diaz-Balart, M.	Hart
Burton (IN)	Doolittle	Hastings (WA)
Buyer	Drake	Hayes
Calvert	Dreier	Hefley

Hensarling	Meehan	Ross
Herger	Meek (FL)	Rothman
Hereth	Melancon	Royce
Higgins	Mica	Ruppersberger
Hobson	Miller (FL)	Ryan (OH)
Hoekstra	Miller (MI)	Ryun (KS)
Holden	Miller (NC)	Sabo
Holt	Miller, Gary	Salazar
Hooley	Miller, George	Saxton
Hostettler	Mollohan	Schiff
Hoyer	Moore (WI)	Schmidt
Hulshof	Moran (KS)	Schwartz (PA)
Hunter	Moran (VA)	Schwarz (MI)
Hyde	Murphy	Scott (GA)
Inglis (SC)	Murtha	Scott (VA)
Issa	Musgrave	Sensenbrenner
Jindal	Myrick	Shadegg
Johnson (CT)	Nadler	Shaw
Johnson (IL)	Neal (MA)	Sherman
Johnson, Sam	Neugebauer	Sherwood
Jones (NC)	Ney	Shimkus
Jones (OH)	Northup	Shuster
Kanjorski	Norwood	Simpson
Kaptur	Nunes	Skelton
Keller	Oberstar	Smith (TX)
Kelly	Oliver	Smith (WA)
Kennedy (MN)	Ortiz	Snyder
Kennedy (RI)	Osborne	Sodrel
King (IA)	Otter	Souder
King (NY)	Oxley	Stearns
Kingston	Pallone	Sullivan
Kirk	Pascrell	Sweeney
Kline	Pastor	Tancredo
Knollenberg	Paul	Tanner
Kuhl (NY)	Payne	Tauscher
LaHood	Pearce	Taylor (MS)
Langevin	Pence	Taylor (NC)
Latham	Peterson (MN)	Terry
LaTourette	Peterson (PA)	Thomas
Leach	Petri	Thornberry
Levin	Pickering	Tiberi
Lewis (CA)	Pitts	Tierney
Lewis (KY)	Platts	Turner
Linder	Poe	Upton
Lucas	Pombo	Van Hollen
Lungren, Daniel E.	Pomeroy	Walden (OR)
Lynch	Porter	Walsh
Mack	Price (GA)	Wamp
Maloney	Price (NC)	Wasserman
Manzulio	Pryce (OH)	Schultz
Marchant	Putnam	Waters
Markey	Radanovich	Watt
McCarthy	Rahall	Weldon (FL)
McCauley (TX)	Ramstad	Weldon (PA)
McCotter	Regula	Weller
McCrery	Rehberg	Westmoreland
McGovern	Reichert	Whitfield
McHenry	Renzi	Wicker
McHugh	Reynolds	Wilson (NM)
McIntyre	Rogers (AL)	Wilson (SC)
McKeon	Rogers (KY)	Wolf
McMorris	Rogers (MI)	Young (FL)
	Rohrabacher	

NOT VOTING—21

Davis (FL)	Hinchey	Ryan (WI)
Davis, Jo Ann	Hinojosa	Sessions
Doyle	Istook	Slaughter
Evans	Jenkins	Smith (NJ)
Forbes	McNulty	Strickland
Green (WI)	Nussle	Tiahrt
Gutierrez	Ros-Lehtinen	Wexler

□ 1440

Messrs. NORWOOD, KANJORSKI, TERRY, REYNOLDS, GARY G. MILLER of California, SHERMAN, BISHOP of Georgia, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts and Mr. CAPUANO changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. ESHOO, Messrs. BOREN, DICKS, KUCINICH, DAVIS of Tennessee and DUNCAN changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT OFFERED BY MR. CONYERS

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. CONYERS. Yes, sir, I am in its present form.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Conyers moves to recommit the bill H.R. 4411 to the Committee on the Judiciary with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

Insert at the end of the bill:

Sec. ____ . RULE TO PROTECT AGAINST UNDER-AGE GAMBLING.

Notwithstanding any provision of this Act, it shall be a violation of section 1084 of title 18 United States Code to knowingly use a communication facility to accept any bet or wager as defined in paragraph 6 as added by section 101(3) of this Act, unless the Attorney General has certified that the person accepting the bet or wager employs a secure and effective customer identity verification system to assure compliance with applicable age and residency requirements.

Mr. CONYERS (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the motion be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Michigan is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, the motion I offer today is a simple and straightforward one. It makes sure that underage kids cannot gamble on the Internet, whether it is connection to interstate or intrastate betting. This is something that I hope that all Members can agree on on a bipartisan basis for, to me, protecting children from being taken advantage of on the Internet is one of the most important things we can do as Members of the Congress.

They should not be taken advantage of whether it is with regard to gambling, pornography or any other respect. Children should be off limits to predators of any form on the Internet.

The problem is, as currently drafted, the bill has a loophole. Intrastate bets have protections in general, but interstate bets are excluded. My concerns are not hypothetical.

Two months ago, the Baltimore Sun ran an article where the horse racing industry admitted that they hoped to prosper by reaching out to underage children. I have made this article a part of the RECORD, and I hope that you will examine it.

□ 1445

To me, that is not right, and we ought to make sure that this legislation, which is purportedly designed to

limit Internet gambling, does not actually encourage it, especially for children.

Now, I would expect that the other side may argue, for example, that my amendment will gut the bill. But that is not true. The amendment merely serves to protect against underage gambling over the Internet. Some might also argue that there are already protections in the bill for underage gambling. But those requirements apply only intrastate. They left out the more important interstate requirements.

Finally, some may argue that the amendment is a poison bill that will kill the bill because it is opposed by powerful interests, or powerful legislators. To that I say that if protecting children from gambling is a poison pill, than maybe this bill deserves to die.

The last thing we should be doing as Members of Congress in the 109th session is putting children at risk on the Internet. My motion would eliminate the loophole in the bill for interstate bets by children.

I ask my colleagues to join me on both sides of the aisle in supporting this commonsense motion to recommit.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, this motion to recommit was dropped on us just a few minutes ago, and we have had a very hasty analysis. And it really is the Trojan horse. If this Trojan horse is allowed to come into the bill by amendment, there are going to be three things that will happen.

First of all, it would require the States, every State that has gambling in any form, to go to the Federal Attorney General to regulate gambling within the State's own borders. And this really is a poison bill, because it would mean that the States' support of this bill would disappear. Forty-nine out of the 50 State attorneys general support this bill, and they are gone if this motion to recommit is passed.

The gentleman from Michigan says that we ought to protect kids. We do protect kids in this bill. And the language that is contained in his motion to recommit is unnecessary because section 1084(c) of the bill does provide age and location requirements. That is ample protection, and it is enforceable protection.

Finally, the motion to recommit is confusing because it requires residency requirements. Now, the bill has location requirements on where the Internet site is. It does not get to the residency requirements of the people who are using the Internet. So there is an entirely different definition, an entirely different thing that will be almost impossible to verify.

I now yield to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE).

Mr. GOODLATTE. I thank the chairman for yielding me this time and for his very patient leadership in getting this legislation to this place.

There are many others to thank on both sides of the aisle: Congressman RICK BOUCHER, Congresswoman DARLENE HOOLEY, who helped get this legislation out of both the Judiciary Committee and the Financial Services Committee.

Congressman MEEHAN, Congresswoman WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Congressman CARDOZA, Congressman MCINTYRE, Congressman VAN HOLLEN have all helped in great ways on the Democratic side, and many, many more.

I am especially deeply indebted to Congressman JIM LEACH. Congressman LEACH has worked on this legislation since the 1990s, as I have. And we have finally managed to bring one bill forward, merging the product of both the Judiciary and the Financial Services Committees, that is the best bill to deal with this scourge of Internet gambling that we have ever confronted.

Members, this is the opportunity to expunge, expunge a smear on this House done by many lobbyists led by one Jack Abramoff, who misled this Congress and many Members about this legislation a long time ago.

The Washington Post, the Atlanta Constitution Journal, many of our publications have exposed that. Now is the time to set the record straight and pass this legislation.

This motion to recommit is not necessary. Our bill already imposes age and location requirements on bets and wagers and requires that the activity be wholly within the authorizing State.

And it is confusing as to which attorney general must approve this. It reduces the authority of the States to create their own laws on gambling within their borders, conflicts with the bill because the Department of Justice asks for two requirements, and this amendment changes that.

Ladies and gentlemen, we have worked out the final solution to this issue. We have done what is necessary to modernize the 45-year-old Wire Act, to make it possible for the Treasury Department and other authorities to work with law enforcement to keep the billions from flowing out of this country, over \$6 billion a year going to unregulated, untaxed, illegal sites outside of the United States.

But most importantly, most importantly of all, as my friend and colleague JIM LEACH said, this is about America's families. This vote is to help families like the one in my district whose son committed suicide.

This vote is for the young student in Congressman DENT's district who, when he ran up thousands of dollars in Internet gambling debts, robbed a bank to pay for this.

Unlike State-regulated gambling, and I am opposed to all forms of gam-

bling, but unlike State-regulated gambling, there are no strictures at all in what these fly-by-night offshore entities do.

Support this legislation. Oppose the motion to recommit and send this great measure across the Capitol for the other body to consider.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, for all of these reasons, I urge the membership to vote "no" on the motion to recommit.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken, and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote on the question of passage.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 167, noes 243, not voting 22, as follows:

[Roll No. 362]

AYES—167

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Andrews
Baca
Baird
Baldwin
Barrow
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boren
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brown (OH)
Brown, Corrine
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Carnahan
Carson
Clay
Clyburn
Conyers
Cooper
Costello
Cramer
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Edwards
Emanuel
Engel
Eshoo

Etheridge
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Ford
Frank (MA)
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Hereth
Higgins
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (OH)
Kaptur
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kind
Kucinich
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowe
Lynch
Markley
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCollum (MN)

McDermott
McGovern
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Michaud
Millender-
McDonald
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (VA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Obey
Oliver
Ortiz
Owens
Pallone
Pascarell
Pastor
Payne
Pelosi
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sanchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanders
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schwartz (PA)
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Shays
Sherman

Skelton
Smith (WA)
Solis
Spratt
Stark
Stupak
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor (MS)

Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Towns
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky

Wasserman
Schultz
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn

NOES—243

Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Bachus
Baker
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Bass
Beauprez
Berry
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonner
Bono
Boozman
Boswell
Boucher
Boustany
Bradley (NH)
Brady (TX)
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite,
Ginny
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Campbell (CA)
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Cardoza
Carter
Case
Castle
Chabot
Chandler
Chocola
Cleaver
Coble
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Costa
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cubin
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Davis (TN)
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Doolittle
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
Ehlers
Emerson
English (PA)
Everett
Feeney
Ferguson
Fitzpatrick (PA)
Flake
Foley
Fortenberry
Fossella
Fox
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly

Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gingrey
Gohmert
Goode
Goodlatte
Granger
Graves
Gutknecht
Hall
Harris
Hart
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Hensarling
Herger
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hookey
Hostettler
Hulshof
Hunter
Hyde
Inglis (SC)
Issa
Jindal
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Kanjorski
Keller
Kelly
Kennedy (MN)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kline
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Latham
LaTourette
Leach
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
LoBiondo
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel
E.
Mack
Maloney
Manzullo
Marchant
McCarthy
McCaul (TX)
McCotter
McCrery
McHenry
McHugh
McIntyre
McKeon
McMorris
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mollohan
Moran (KS)
Murphy
Murtha
Musgrave
Myrick

Neugebauer
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nunes
Oberstar
Osborne
Otter
Oxley
Paul
Pearce
Pence
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Poe
Pombo
Porter
Price (GA)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Ramstad
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ross
Royce
Ryun (KS)
Sabo
Salazar
Saxton
Schmidt
Schwarz (MI)
Sensenbrenner
Shaw
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shuster
Simmons
Simpson
Smith (TX)
Snyder
Soderl
Souder
Stearns
Sullivan
Sweeney
Tancred
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thornberry
Tiberi
Turner
Upton
Walden (OR)
Walsh
Wamp
Waters
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—22

Davis (FL)	Hinojosa	Sessions
Davis, Jo Ann	Istook	Slaughter
Doyle	Jenkins	Smith (NJ)
Evans	McKinney	Strickland
Forbes	McNulty	Tiahrt
Green (WI)	Nussle	Wexler
Gutierrez	Ros-Lehtinen	
Hinchey	Ryan (WI)	

□ 1509

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 317, noes 93, not voting 22, as follows:

[Roll No. 363]

AYES—317

Aderholt	Coble	Harris
Akin	Cole (OK)	Hart
Alexander	Conaway	Hayes
Allen	Cooper	Hayworth
Bachus	Costa	Hefley
Baird	Costello	Hensarling
Baker	Cramer	Hergert
Barrett (SC)	Crenshaw	Herseth
Barrow	Crowley	Higgins
Bartlett (MD)	Cubin	Hobson
Barton (TX)	Cuellar	Hoekstra
Bass	Culberson	Holt
Bean	Davis (AL)	Hooley
Beauprez	Davis (CA)	Hostettler
Berry	Davis (KY)	Hulshof
Biggert	Davis (TN)	Hunter
Bilbray	Davis, Tom	Hyde
Bilirakis	Deal (GA)	Inglis (SC)
Bishop (GA)	DeFazio	Issa
Bishop (NY)	DeGette	Jefferson
Bishop (UT)	DeLauro	Jindal
Blackburn	Dent	Johnson (CT)
Blumenauer	Diaz-Balart, L.	Johnson (IL)
Blunt	Diaz-Balart, M.	Johnson, Sam
Boehlert	Dicks	Jones (NC)
Boehner	Doggett	Jones (OH)
Bonilla	Doilittle	Kanjorski
Bonner	Drake	Kaptur
Bono	Duncan	Keller
Boozman	Edwards	Kelly
Boren	Ehlers	Kennedy (MN)
Boswell	Emanuel	King (IA)
Boucher	Emerson	King (NY)
Boustany	English (PA)	Kingston
Boyd	Etheridge	Kirk
Bradley (NH)	Everett	Kline
Brady (PA)	Fattah	Knollenberg
Brady (TX)	Feeney	Kuhl (NY)
Brown (OH)	Ferguson	LaHood
Brown (SC)	Fitzpatrick (PA)	Langevin
Brown-Waite,	Ford	Lantos
Ginny	Fortenberry	Larsen (WA)
Burgess	Fox	Larson (CT)
Burton (IN)	Franks (AZ)	Latham
Butterfield	Frelinghuysen	LaTourette
Buyer	Gallely	Leach
Calvert	Garrett (NJ)	Levin
Camp (MI)	Gerlach	Lewis (CA)
Campbell (CA)	Gilchrest	Lewis (GA)
Cannon	Gillmor	Lewis (KY)
Cantor	Gingrey	Linder
Capito	Gohmert	Lipinski
Cardin	Goode	Lowe
Cardoza	Goodlatte	Lucas
Carter	Gordon	Lungren, Daniel
Case	Granger	E.
Castle	Graves	Lynch
Chabot	Green, Al	Maloney
Chandler	Green, Gene	Manzullo
Chocola	Gutknecht	Marchant
Cleaver	Hall	Marshall
Clyburn	Harman	Matheson

McCarthy	Pence	Simpson
McCaul (TX)	Peterson (MN)	Skelton
McCollum (MN)	Peterson (PA)	Smith (TX)
McCotter	Petri	Smith (WA)
McCrery	Pickering	Snyder
McHugh	Pitts	Sodrel
McIntyre	Platts	Souder
McKeon	Pomeroy	Spratt
McMorris	Price (GA)	Stearns
Meehan	Price (NC)	Stupak
Meek (FL)	Pryce (OH)	Sullivan
Meeks (NY)	Putnam	Sweeney
Melancon	Radanovich	Tancredo
Mica	Rahall	Tanner
Michaud	Ramstad	Taylor (MS)
Millender-	Regula	Taylor (NC)
McDonald	Rehberg	Terry
Miller (FL)	Reichert	Thomas
Miller (MI)	Renzi	Thompson (CA)
Miller (NC)	Reynolds	Thompson (MS)
Miller, Gary	Rogers (AL)	Thornberry
Mollohan	Rogers (KY)	Turner
Moore (KS)	Rogers (MI)	Udall (CO)
Moore (WI)	Ross	Upton
Moran (KS)	Royce	Van Hollen
Moran (VA)	Ruppersberger	Visclosky
Murphy	Ryan (OH)	Walden (OR)
Murtha	Ryun (KS)	Walsh
Musgrave	Sabo	Wamp
Myrick	Salazar	Wasserman
Neugebauer	Sanders	Schultz
Northup	Saxton	Waters
Norwood	Schmidt	Waxman
Nunes	Schwartz (PA)	Weldon (FL)
Oberstar	Schwarz (MI)	Weldon (PA)
Obey	Scott (GA)	Weller
Ortiz	Sensenbrenner	Westmoreland
Osborne	Shadegg	Whitfield
Otter	Shaw	Wicker
Oxley	Shays	Wilson (NM)
Pallone	Sherman	Wilson (SC)
Pascarella	Sherwood	Wolf
Payne	Shinkus	Wu
Pearce	Shuster	Wynn
Pelosi	Simmons	Young (FL)

NOES—93

Abercrombie	Hastings (WA)	Pastor
Ackerman	Holden	Paul
Andrews	Honda	Poe
Baca	Hoyer	Pombo
Baldwin	Inslee	Porter
Becerra	Israel	Rangel
Berkley	Jackson (IL)	Reyes
Berman	Jackson-Lee	Rohrabacher
Brown, Corrine	(TX)	Rothman
Capps	Johnson, E. B.	Roybal-Allard
Capuano	Kennedy (RI)	Rush
Carnahan	Kildee	Sánchez, Linda
Carson	Kilpatrick (MI)	T.
Clay	Kind	Sanchez, Loretta
Conyers	Kolbe	Schakowsky
Cummings	Kucinich	Schiff
Davis (IL)	Lee	Scott (VA)
Delahunt	LoBiondo	Serrano
Dingell	Lofgren, Zoe	Solis
Dreier	Mack	Stark
Engel	Markey	Tauscher
Eshoo	Matsui	Tiberi
Farr	McDermott	Tierney
Finer	McGovern	Towns
Flake	McKinney	Udall (NM)
Foley	Miller, George	Velázquez
Fossella	Nadler	Watson
Frank (MA)	Napolitano	Watt
Gibbons	Neal (MA)	Weiner
Gonzalez	Ney	Woolsey
Grijalva	Olver	Young (AK)
Hastings (FL)	Owens	

NOT VOTING—22

Davis (FL)	Hinojosa	Sessions
Davis, Jo Ann	Istook	Slaughter
Doyle	Jenkins	Smith (NJ)
Evans	McHenry	Strickland
Forbes	McNulty	Tiahrt
Green (WI)	Nussle	Wexler
Gutierrez	Ros-Lehtinen	
Hinchey	Ryan (WI)	

□ 1518

Mr. RYAN of Ohio changed his vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. FORBES. Mr. Speaker, due to my attendance at a funeral for a family member of my staff I was unavoidably detained from voting on H.R. 4411, the Unlawful Internet Gambling Enforcement Act of 2006. Had I been present, I would have voted “aye” on final passage and “nay” on the passage of the Berkley/Conyers/Wexler amendment. I support passage of H.R. 4411 in the Judiciary Committee and I continue to support efforts to rein in the proliferation of internet gambling.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, if I were present for today's vote on rollcall 363, passage of H.R. 4411, the Internet Gambling Prohibition and Enforcement Act of 2006, I would have voted “aye”. In addition, I would have voted “nay” on rollcall 361, the amendment offered by Ms. BERKLEY, because I feel it would have undermined the intent of the legislation. I also would have opposed rollcall 362, the motion to recommit.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. GUTIERREZ. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably absent from this chamber today, due to illness. Had I been present, I would have voted “no” on rollcall vote 360 and 361, “yea” on rollcall vote 362 and “no” on rollcall vote 363.

CELEBRATING ADVANCEMENT VIA INDIVIDUAL DETERMINATION'S 25 YEARS OF SUCCESS

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 576) celebrating Advancement Via Individual Determination's 25 years of success, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 576

Whereas Advancement Via Individual Determination (AVID) has provided academic and motivational support that has enabled more than 95 percent of the over 257,000 underperforming students who have been in its program to go on to college;

Whereas Advancement Via Individual Determination has grown over 25 years to more than 2,200 middle and high schools in 36 States and Department of Defense schools in 15 countries;

Whereas Advancement Via Individual Determination started in 1980 with one teacher and 32 high school students in San Diego, California, and developed into an easily replicated program that promotes academic success;

Whereas students are selected because they are low-income, first-generation, college-going students who are underperforming academically;

Whereas college students support the program with individual academic coaching;

Whereas students are required to take a rigorous, college preparatory curriculum including advanced level courses;

Whereas the program provides SAT/ACT preparation, college information and financial aid assistance, college visits, and motivational experiences;

Whereas at the end of the first college year, 89 percent of Advancement Via Individual Determination students are fully eligible and do enroll for their sophomore year

compared to a national average of 50 percent; and

Whereas over 98,000 teachers and administrators have attended training in the high-quality teaching skills that support Advancement Via Individual Determination students: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) congratulates Advancement Via Individual Determination students and their teachers on increasing college eligibility and attendance; and

(2) celebrates Advancement Via Individual Determination's 25 years of success.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PRICE of Georgia). Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Delaware (Mr. CASTLE) and the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. DAVIS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Delaware.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on H. Res. 576.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Delaware?

There was no objection.

Mr. CASTLE. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of House Resolution 576, celebrating the success of the Advancement Via Individual Determination program, also known as AVID.

AVID began in one classroom in 1980, and has now trained more than 98,000 educators and nearly 260,000 student alumni. Fortunately, AVID is beginning to spread to the East Coast, and has already reached five schools in my home State of Delaware.

The accomplishments of AVID extend beyond the growth and expansion of the program. AVID seeks to help underachieving students by providing them with the support they need to take challenging classes and go on to college. School officials select average students making Cs and Ds, but have the potential to do better, and then place them in honors and college-prep classes with academic and motivational support. Over the past 25 years, more than 95 percent of the almost 260,000 students who have participated in the program have gone to college.

AVID takes strong evidence of what we know to be true about closing the achievement gap and provides it for those students who not only need the assistance, but also want it. In addition to providing assistance and guidance to help students achieve, the program drives success by promoting rigorous standards, coupled with professional development not only for teachers, but also for school and district administrators. These are key components to any successful education program.

Over the course of the past several years, there has been a growing debate surrounding our high schools. There is

much to do, but I am thrilled by the response from all levels of government, as well as the private sector. Some of what we have heard about the struggles in our high schools is exactly what AVID embraces, the notion that there is a silent majority, average students who do okay in ordinary classes. The fear of failure often steers them away from more challenging course work or from seeking a postsecondary degree. I commend AVID for recognizing this need 25 years ago, and I commend those school districts that have incorporated the program into their schools.

I would also like to thank the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. DAVIS) for bringing this program to my attention, and I congratulate our Delaware schools and students who participate. Here is to another 25 years.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleague from Delaware (Mr. CASTLE), and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I would like to take this time to recognize a tremendous and extremely valuable asset to public education in the United States that began in my city of San Diego in 1980. The Advancement Via Individual Determination, or AVID, program has helped hundreds of thousands of underachieving middle and high school students across the United States learn the study habits and the skills needed to get into college and graduate; and for many of them to be the first in their family to go to college and to graduate.

A teacher at Clairemont High School, Mary Catherine Swanson, created AVID because she wanted to find a way to help students tap their true potential and help them achieve academic success. The program emphasizes individual achievement, while teaching sound study skills and new study habits. AVID also encourages goal setting, and works to lift self-expectations and self-esteem in students so they can rise to the challenge.

Mary Catherine Swanson recently retired, and now is the perfect time to celebrate what she accomplished for education through the AVID program. While overseeing the program for 25 years, AVID went from one classroom in San Diego to over 2,300 middle and high schools in 36 States and 15 nations abroad. Nearly 260,000 students have benefited tremendously from its ground-breaking teaching methods, encouraging time management, sound study habits, self-confidence, and hard work.

These students enroll in the toughest classes, such as AP courses, and are given the support and resources to rise to the challenge through AVID. Amazingly, over 95 percent of those who complete the AVID program attend college, and 89 percent of these students return for their sophomore year.

Mr. Speaker, it is difficult to choose from the thousands of success stories produced by AVID. The program helped

U.S. Olympic athlete Joanna Hayes earn the grades and develop the study habits needed to attend UCLA. Joanna then went on to win the Gold in the 100-Meter Hurdle event at the 2004 Summer Olympics in Greece, and she attributes her success in part to the discipline she learned from AVID.

Another great story is that of AVID student Truong-Son Vinh, who earned degrees in engineering and applied math from the University of California at San Diego after high school. Vinh came to the United States as a boy when his family fled Vietnam after it fell to the North in the 1970s, and he went on to apply his knowledge and skills working for NASA.

There are thousands of success stories. AVID students have gone on to earn advanced degrees in all key subjects and disciplines.

I want to thank Mary Catherine Swanson for having a vision and working hard to implement this vision beginning with one classroom and 32 students at Clairemont High. And I want to thank the teachers and the tutors for their dedication, and also recognize the students who had the courage to take on the rigorous academic track required by AVID, and who had the desire to go on one day and find success in college.

I want to thank my colleague, Congressman CASTLE, for his efforts on behalf of this resolution, and also I would like to thank Chairman McKEON and House leadership for bringing House Res. 576 to the floor today.

If we are to eliminate the achievement gap in the United States and remain competitive globally, I believe we need to build upon the programs that have proven success, encouraging and inspiring hard work in academics. AVID is clearly one of these programs, and I know it will continue its tradition of success in the years to come.

Finally, as we look at the No Child Left Behind reauthorization and how we can improve it, I believe it is more than worthwhile to look at programs such as AVID. AVID provides the strong and uniform training techniques to those who oversee it in schools across the Nation. It sets high standards for both its instructors and its students.

AVID is not about one community or one region, but a national push to encourage strong academic standards, and provides the accountability and support to back up those standards. It further gives the students the support they need both academically and socially to achieve in difficult classes.

I encourage my colleagues to support passage of this resolution today and encourage my colleagues to learn from this highly successful program.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Speaker, I would like again to thank the gentlewoman from California. It is her initiative that brings us here to the floor today to recognize this excellent program, and I encourage everyone to support it.

I yield back the balance of my time. The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Delaware (Mr. CASTLE) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 576, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING PRINTING OF SENATE PROCEDURE

Mr. EHLERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on House Administration be discharged from further consideration of the Senate joint resolution (S.J. Res. 40) authorizing the printing and binding of a supplement to, and revised edition of, Senate Procedure, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate joint resolution, as follows:

S.J. RES. 40

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. PRINTING OF SUPPLEMENT TO, AND REVISED EDITION OF, SENATE PROCEDURE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Each of the following documents shall be prepared under the supervision of Alan Frumin, Parliamentarian and Parliamentarian Emeritus of the Senate, and shall be printed and bound as a Senate document:

(1) A supplement to “Riddick’s Senate Procedure”, to be styled “Frumin’s Supplement to Riddick’s Senate Procedure”.

(2) A revised edition of “Riddick’s Senate Procedure”, to be styled “Frumin’s Senate Procedure”.

(b) COPIES.—One thousand five hundred copies of each document described in subsection (a) shall be printed for distribution to Senators and for the use of the Senate.

The Senate joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 1530

APPROVING RENEWAL OF IMPORT RESTRICTIONS CONTAINED IN BURMESE FREEDOM AND DEMOCRACY ACT OF 2003

Mr. SHAW. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 86) approving the renewal of import restrictions contained in the Burmese Freedom and Democracy Act of 2003, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.J. RES. 86

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. AMENDMENT TO BURMESE FREEDOM AND DEMOCRACY ACT OF 2003.

Section 9(b)(3) of the Burmese Freedom and Democracy Act of 2003 (Public Law 108-61; 50 U.S.C. 1701 note) is amended by striking “three years” and inserting “six years”.

SEC. 2. RENEWAL OF IMPORT RESTRICTIONS UNDER BURMESE FREEDOM AND DEMOCRACY ACT OF 2003.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Congress approves the renewal of import restrictions contained in section 3(a)(1) of the Burmese Freedom and Democracy Act of 2003.

(b) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—This joint resolution shall be deemed to be a “renewal resolution” for purposes of section 9 of the Burmese Freedom and Democracy Act of 2003.

SEC. 3. EFFECTIVE DATE.

This Act and the amendments made by this Act shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act or July 26, 2006, whichever occurs first.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SHAW) and the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. SHAW. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.J. Res. 86. According to the State Department, the Burmese military regime has resisted all international pressure to enact meaningful political reforms and create true democracy. In response, for many years now, the United States has imposed sanctions, including banning all imports from Burma. Additionally, we have prohibited exportation of financial services from the United States to Burma and have targeted the regime itself by freezing certain assets.

Today the passage of this resolution is necessary to extend for 1 year the import restrictions enacted within the Burmese Freedom and Democracy Act of 2003. On February 7, 2006, Assistant Secretary of State for East Asian and Pacific Affairs, Christopher Hill, testified that these sanctions are “an essential component of our strategy.” He went on to say that “they serve as a constant reminder to the regime, and everyone else concerned with Burma, that its behavior is unacceptable, and that regime leaders will remain international pariahs as long as they continue this behavior.”

As chairman of the Ways and Means Subcommittee on Trade, I do not support trade sanctions lightly. However, Burma has not taken the necessary steps to warrant lifting these sanctions. The Burmese regime claims it is implementing its so-called road map to democracy, but in truth it is taking no such steps.

The State Department has found that the delegates charged with creating the constitution that this democracy would be built upon are all hand-picked supporters of the current regime. Additionally, pro-democracy advocates remain imprisoned, and military conflicts continue with internal groups.

Perhaps most disturbing are reports that Burma’s human rights record con-

tinues to worsen. In 2005, security forces in the country continued to rape and murder Burmese citizens, force them into slave labor, and compel people into serving in militia units to defend the regime that they abhor.

Since enactment of the Burmese Freedom and Democracy Act, the Treasury Department has blocked over \$16.8 million in transactions and frozen hundreds of thousands of dollars of assets belonging to the Burmese regime. The vast majority of democratic opposition within Burma supports the continuation of these sanctions and even welcomes additional actions.

It is now incumbent upon all of us to ensure that the “essential component” Assistant Secretary Hill referenced remains in place until this murderous regime yields to the desire of its citizens to be free. To back down now would send the wrong message to the military regime in Burma as well as the international community. Most importantly, it would send the wrong message to those pro-democracy advocates within Burma fighting for the freedom of their fellow citizens.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me today in supporting this important measure and vote “aye” on H.J. Res. 86.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.J. Res. 86, a resolution extending trade sanctions against Burma.

It is imperative that the United States continue sanctions against Burma so as to maintain pressure on the government of Burma to end its brutal repression against the Burmese people.

The government of Burma’s litany of abuses is appalling. According to the U.S. State Department and human rights organizations, the government of Burma has continued to arrest and imprison supporters of democracy for alleged political offenses. Over 1,100 persons remain in jail today for their political beliefs.

Earlier this year, the government of Burma extended the detention of Aung San Suu Kyi, the leader of the National League of Democracy, a pro-democracy party, and her deputy. Aung San Suu Kyi has spent 10 of the last 17 years in confinement.

Burmese security forces regularly monitor the movement and communication of residents, search homes without warrants, and relocate people without compensation or legal recourse. The government of Burma has failed to crack down on trafficking in persons; and, in fact, the government of Burma has sanctioned the use of forced labor. In fact, the government of Burma has supported the use of forced labor for large infrastructure projects, forced children to join the Burmese Army, imprisoned individuals who have communicated with the International Labor Organization on the subject of forced labor.

Further, the Burmese government has destroyed nearly 3,000 villages in its campaign to forcibly relocate minority ethnic groups.

Mr. Speaker, the world simply cannot stand by as Burma continues its brutal policies. I am pleased that the European Union recently acted to renew its sanctions against Burma and that many nations in the world have spoken out against the repression in Burma. It is particularly meaningful that in December 2005 the Association of Southeast Asian Nations, ASEAN, which counts Burma as one of its members, issued a statement calling for the release of political prisoners and democracy reforms in Burma.

Mr. Speaker, the Western world and those who are concerned about human rights are united: Burma cannot be allowed to continue its oppressive actions. The use of sanctions is appropriate, and I urge my colleagues to support this resolution.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I first want to thank my good friend and colleague, Congressman BEN CARDIN, for his leadership on trade and human rights issues.

I also want to express my appreciation to Ways and Means Committee Chairman BILL THOMAS for his strong support, over many years, for import sanctions against Burma, and for moving this legislation to the floor expeditiously. As always, I also remain deeply appreciative of the work of the Ranking Democrat on the Ways and Means Committee, my friend and colleague CHARLIE RANGEL.

Mr. Speaker, former South African Archbishop Desmond Tutu—the winner of the Nobel Peace Prize for his tireless and ultimately successful fight for freedom in South Africa—spoke eloquently about the key role of the international community in helping to free oppressed nations.

He said, "If you are neutral in situations of injustice, you have chosen the side of the oppressor. If an elephant has its foot on the tail of a mouse and you say that you are neutral, the mouse will not appreciate your neutrality."

Mr. Speaker, with passage of this legislation, Congress will once again signal firmly that the United States is not neutral when it comes to Burma. We are firmly on the side of imprisoned Nobel Laureate Aung San Suu Kyi and all those who are oppressed by Burma's ruling thugs.

Some argue the U.S. sanctions do not help those who suffer the most under Burma's oppressive political and economic system. Again, I would respectfully refer them to Archbishop Tutu, whose homeland of South Africa is free today because the international community refused to remain silent about the brutal system of Apartheid.

By voting to maintain our Nation's tough approach towards Burma, we once again lead the world by example. Step by step, we will move assertively towards a global sanctions regime against Burma involving all of the world's leading economic players.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, there are signs that American leadership on Burma is paying off.

Just a few short months ago, the United Nations Security Council held an unprecedented debate on Burma's horrendous human rights situation and its destabilizing role in Southeast Asia. Further Security Council action against

Burma is on the near horizon, particularly since the Burmese leadership thumbed its nose at Kofi Annan's hand-picked special envoy to Burma, and refused to release Aung San Suu Kyi.

The political leadership of the Association of Southeast Asian Nations—ASEAN—has also long maintained that Burma's political situation was an "internal affair." But Singaporean Foreign Minister George Yeo recently said that Southeast Asia may need to "distance itself" from Burma if it does not undergo political reform, and the ASEAN leaders refused to let Burma become chairman of the important regional organization in 2006.

The European Union has also firmly resisted the entreaties of the European commercial class—always eager for new trade opportunities with the world's rogue regimes—to reduce sanctions against Burma.

Mr. Speaker, while these are positive developments, we remain a long way from a comprehensive, global sanctions regime. But Mr. Speaker, I am prepared to wait as long as it takes to convince the international community to act properly.

The only hope for promoting far-reaching political change is by making Burma's thugocracy pay an economic price for running their nation into the ground. I would welcome a negotiated solution to the crisis in Burma, but I believe firmly that such negotiations will only bear fruit once those pulling the levers of power feel a strong economic pinch.

Today, we will act decisively to renew import sanctions against Burma, and send an unmistakable signal of support for the restoration of democracy and human rights in that impoverished nation.

One day, Aung San Suu Kyi will lead a democratic Burma, and I look forward to being at her inauguration before a throng of her countrymen, all finally free. Until then, we in this country must do what we can to hasten that day.

I urge all of my colleagues to support this important legislation.

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the resolution that my good friend from California, Mr. LANTOS introduced. I am proud to have my name attached to this resolution as an original cosponsor.

Mr. LANTOS has been leading the way when it comes to fighting the repressive junta that controls Burma with an iron fist and I would like to commend him for his continued support.

The United States has been a leader in pushing the world to recognize the atrocities the military junta in Burma commits on a daily basis.

Mr. Speaker, because of our country's diplomatic efforts on a multilateral front the military junta is feeling the pressure.

The European Union had joined us in placing sanctions on the regime, a step that shows the unity of the West against the junta's human rights violations. Two weeks ago, for the first time Swiss banks froze all assets of the military regime.

For the first time the ASEAN nations are openly calling for the release of Aung San Suu Kyi and all political prisoners. Countries like Singapore and the Philippines have made strong statements showing that ASEAN has lost its patience with the continued lack of promised reforms from the junta.

The United Nations Security Council has met twice over the past seven months to dis-

cuss the horrible situation in Burma, a first for the U.N.

Thankfully, the Security Council is currently considering its first-ever resolution on Burma.

We are at a monumental point in the history of Burma. My hope is that all members of the Security Council will support this resolution.

I urge all of my colleagues to continue to support the people of Burma who have suffered under this brutal military junta.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.J. Res. 86, a bill intended to extend the import restrictions imposed by the Burmese Freedom and Democracy Act of 2003. This act was initially passed in response to the failure of Burma's ruling body to take significant actions to establish a democratic government, and for its reluctance to address violations of human rights and the pervasive drug problems within its borders. The governing body of Burma has yet to take effective corrective action.

Burma is presently under the rule of a military regime, the State Peace and Development Council. This military junta, or one like it, has been in control of the Burmese government for the greater part of Burma's independence since 1948. Democratic rule in Burma ended in 1962 in a coup d'etat. The National League for Democracy, led by Aung San Suu Kyi, won a free election held in 1990, but the ruling military regime, then the SLORC (State Law and Order Restoration Council), voided the election and impeded the formation of a democratic government.

The SLORC has since become the SPDC, and Aung San Suu Kyi has spent the last 17 years in and out of detention and house arrest. She has been offered freedom in exchange for her voluntary exile, but she, with the backing of millions of supporters around the world, continues to stand against an oppressive regime and fight for democracy. She was in detention in 1999 when her husband died from cancer, as authorities would not allow for him to visit or for her to return if she visited him while he was ill. Aung San Suu Kyi has been relentless in her work and advocacy and was the recipient of the 1991 Nobel Peace Prize for her struggle. It will take more men and women of her courage and character to free her country from its oppressors within. Yet the world has yet to respond with the required urgency.

In the year 2004, Burma was the world's second largest producer of illicit opium, with an estimated production of 292 metric tons. Though this number was down 40% from 2003 due to eradication efforts and drought, land cultivation in 2004 was still 30,900 hectares. The government has shown little interest in addressing this problem.

Human rights violations in Burma have been documented for years, and it is generally agreed to that the military regime currently in power is one of the most repressive, violent, and inhumane in the world. The atrocities include forced labor, conscription of children, repression of free speech and political freedom, and the state-sanctioned use of torture and rape as weapons of war.

It is estimated that several hundreds of thousands of men, women, children, and elderly are being forced to work against their will in what the International Labor Organization of the UN calls a "modern form of slavery." Human Rights Watch estimates that some 70,000 of the regime's soldiers are children. A

2004 report by Amnesty International estimates that more than 1,300 people were wrongfully imprisoned between 1989 and 2004; and there were an estimated 1,600 political prisoners in 2005, 38 of which were elected members of Parliament.

The U.S. State Department and two NGOs have confirmed that torture and rape are being used as weapons of war. A report issued in 2002 by The Shan Human Rights Foundation and the Shan Women's Action Network documents 173 cases of rape and sexual violence involving 625 girls and women. The study points out that 61 % were gang-rapes and that 25% of these girls and women died, some of whom were detained and repeatedly raped for up to four months. A report released by Refugees International in April of 2003 also documents cases of rape. These crimes are largely targeted at ethnic minorities, including the Shan, Mon, Karenni, and the Karen.

Testifying before the House Committee on International Relations earlier this year, Human Rights Watch advocacy director Tom Malinowski stated that, "Government armed forces continue to engage in summary executions, torture, and the rape of women and girls. This campaign can only be described as ethnic cleaning on a very large scale. Hundreds of thousands of people, most of them from ethnic minority groups, live precariously inside Burma as internally displaced people."

A CBO report estimates that supporting this legislation could cost the U.S. \$500,000 in 2006 and \$1 million in 2007. It is likely that there will be economic costs on the other end as well, and not just for those in power. So while it is understandable and even necessary to take action in opposition of the current military regime and to condemn their oppressive rule and blatant abuses of human rights, we should explore other methods to express our disapproval and impose sanctions. We must be careful that our actions do not oppress the innocent who are caught up in this ongoing struggle.

So I urge my colleagues to support H.J. Res. 86, but I also ask that we devise additional ways to assist the people of Burma, ways that may not entail economic backlashes. Over the years we have seen situations like this arise and escalate and we have watched with shameful apathy as millions have perished or fallen victims to unspeakable physical, sexual, and emotional violence. And here we are again with another opportunity to act or be apathetic. Let us not squander it under the cover of feigned ignorance. We are all aware now. Let us not get selective amnesia by confining our thoughts to tangential concerns of a lesser gravity, for history will not forget when we stand idly by while these people suffer, scream, and die. Instead, let us free Ms. Aung San Suu Kyi, and free those for which she remains confined.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SHAW. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SHAW) that the House suspend the rules and pass the joint resolution, H.J. Res. 86.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the joint resolution was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SHAW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials with regard to H.J. Res. 86.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2005, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. EMANUEL) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. EMANUEL addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

THE OCCUPATION OF IRAQ

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentlewoman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, on March 1, 2003, the United States stopped fighting a war in Iraq and became the occupants of Iraq. That was when the U.S. occupation began.

March 1, 2003, is the day that President Bush, speaking under a huge banner with the words "Mission Accomplished" declared major combat operations in Iraq had ended. At that moment, the United States military should have left Iraq.

Military commanders and policy experts advised the President, but he failed to grasp that deploying hundreds of thousands of soldiers to Iraq and invading Baghdad would be like sticking your hand in a beehive and trying to remove it without getting stung.

Even the President's father, President George H.W. Bush, agreed on this point. That is why during the first Gulf War during 1991, he stopped short of having the U.S. military actually enter Baghdad.

If we had left after, according to the President, the "mission" had been "accomplished," we could have prevented the deaths of over 2,400 American soldiers. More than 18,000 others wouldn't have returned home with life-changing injuries, and thousands of others wouldn't suffer from severe psychological trauma as a result of fighting a war halfway across the world. And countless thousands, tens of thousands

of innocent Iraqi civilians who have been killed might still be alive in Iraq.

The last 3½ years since the President's "mission accomplished" speech have been unsuccessful in all ways in Iraq. This war has drained America's coffers of nearly \$400 billion, money that could have been used for underfunded programs right here at home, like addressing key homeland security needs, providing health care to all Americans, giving all American children a first-class education.

This war has diminished America's role as an international leader. Our role and our image have suffered great damage as a result of our involvement in Iraq. We are even less safe here at home, and Iraqis are less safe in Iraq than before the United States invaded Iraq.

It is actually the very presence of 150,000 American soldiers in Iraq that has enraged and dissatisfied the people of the Arab world.

Mr. Speaker, this is not a war; this is an occupation. The Pentagon and the White House have turned our troops into occupiers against their will, placing them in an absolutely impossible situation. This is not what they were trained for. Soldiers can win a war, but how do they win an occupation? An occupation is by its very nature unwinnable. There is no winning; all you can do is come home.

The President does not seem to understand this truth which is made very clear in comments he makes like "we will accept nothing short of total victory in Iraq"; or "we will stay in Iraq until the job gets done."

Mr. Speaker, the American people understand that there is no such thing as "getting the job done in Iraq" because it is not a job, it is an occupation. What Congress needs to do is take back the powers it gave to the President more than 3 years ago. It is time to rescind the legislation that gave him the authority to use force in Iraq. And while we are at it, let's do the right thing for our soldiers, their families and the entire country: end the occupation.

The least we can do for our troops is thank them for their service and bring them home to their families.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. OSBORNE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. OSBORNE addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

BORDER SECURITY

Mr. POE. Mr. Speaker, I request permission to take Mr. OSBORNE's time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. POE. Mr. Speaker, the State of Texas is a little richer today. But the

money found along our border was not American money; it was money from the Middle East. A Sudanese dinar was found not too long ago along the Texas-Mexico border.

This type of money is a whole lot more dangerous because it brings with it someone carrying this money.

□ 1545

Someone that came into the United States obviously illegally from the nation of Mexico. The Sudanese dinar was discovered on our border, a clue that could have been easily lost among the trash trails illegal invaders from around the world leave behind.

But unlike most, the person carrying that dinar may not dream of a better life in the United States. He probably didn't come to the United States looking for work. He could covet death and a whole lot of it.

The threat of illegals infiltrating America is not just a threat to our economic security, it is a threat to our national security.

Now, so many OTMs, in the vernacular, Other Than Mexico, are coming into the United States, especially into Texas the, terrorist threat increases. These people come from all over the world. They come from China, they come from Korea, they come from the Middle East. They come from Africa, they come from South America and they come from Europe.

During recent national security hearings, clear and convincing evidence was released showing that the dark and deadly underground, created and thriving on human trafficking and on drug smuggling, is now diversifying into terrorism. Reports indicate that al Qaeda operatives have moved to Mexico, have assimilated into the population, have learned Spanish, and they are studying the culture and they are posing as Mexican workers. They create an illusion, then they wait, make their way to America. All the while, the hatred in their hearts is anything but phony. They know illegal entry allows them to live here and remain untraceable. It is the very freedom that they want to destroy. They will use that against us to infiltrate and weaken our Nation.

For almost 5 years now, Mr. Speaker, we have been hunkering down, our eyes really turned north to Canada, the country that has long been touted by some as the de facto entry point for illegals. All the way terrorists could easily be sneaking through our back door, the southern border into the United States. They could pose as a day laborer, a blue collar worker, moving, then plotting undetected in the shadowy night and the broad daylight, among the people willing to break laws to earn money to send home.

These are people who are willing to break into our country, our country. These are criminals who are bent on evil with hearts full of malice and mischief. They act in the name of radicalism and destruction and hatred.

Mr. Speaker, we may have terrorists living among us. You have heard the

phrase, "It's not if, but when." Failure to protect our borders, failure to prevent OTMs from entering the United States puts America at risk.

Then continuing this absolute absurd policy of capturing these OTMs from other countries and then telling them, on their oath, they need to come back to court for their deportation hearing, is absurd. We are not shocked that over 90 percent of them never return, but yet they are released into the heartland of the United States.

This nonsense needs to stop. We need to find places for those who have decided to enter our country illegally, hold them and detain them until they get quick deportation hearings, then send them home where they belong.

The duty of our government is to protect the citizens of this Nation. We protect the borders of other countries. We need to protect our own border. Border security is a national security issue. And we must have the moral will to protect the dignity and sovereignty of this Nation. And that's just the way it is.

SOCIAL SECURITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MCCARTHY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. MCCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, we are hearing once again that there are rumors going around that in January, when we come back and there is a new Congress, depending on who is in control, that we are going to be looking at privatizing Social Security again. We understand that the Republican Party wants to make it their top priority. The American people have already said "no" to this shortsighted plan. The money and trust fund belongs to the people who put it there, and they are entitled to guaranteed benefits. They don't want to use this money to gamble on the risky stock market.

Those in favor of the Republican plan say that privatizing is the only way to save Social Security. Granted, the fact that people are growing older does mean Social Security needs to be strengthened. But in reality, Social Security can be saved with small changes, and we have time to make sure we do it right.

As it stands today, the Social Security trust fund will begin taking in less in payroll taxes than it pays out in benefits in 2018. That is 12 years from now. But even if Congress doesn't act, the Social Security surplus won't be exhausted until the year 2040. That is 34 years from today. And the worst case scenario is that 74 percent of benefits would still be paid.

If the Republican plan is enacted next year, they won't be able to guarantee benefits in 2008, let alone 2040.

In addition, these projections are based on an anticipated lower rate of productivity and economic growth than the U.S. has experienced during the last 20 years. If the U.S. maintains

its current economic growth or grows at a faster rate, the trust fund surplus will expire at a later date.

While I believe Congress needs to act soon, we don't need to do it in haste. Instead of radically changing our retirement safety net, we should follow the lead of former President Reagan. In 1983, President Reagan appointed a commission headed by Alan Greenspan and saved Social Security for the next 60 years.

I urge President Bush to put aside his dreams of privatizing and do the same. Many Republicans won't want to hear this, but President Reagan's commission raised payroll taxes to save Social Security. But I believe we can come up with a better solution today. There is a middle ground between raising taxes and privatizing. Let's put our experts to work on finding this middle ground and creating a stronger Social Security.

Everybody accepts that Congress needs to act to strengthen Social Security for the next generation of seniors. But any plan that cuts guaranteed benefits is a nonstarter. It is a nonstarter because the centerpiece of the Republican plan, to privatize portions of Social Security does nothing to address the program's long-term challenge, which is to make sure Social Security can pay full benefits for future generations.

Privatizing means less money going into the Social Security trust fund. The President's plan means fewer benefits for more retirees. The President has yet to disclose how he would pay for this plan. Conservative estimates price the plan at over \$2 trillion, driving the country deeper into debt and burdening future generations with the bill.

With our current national debt, a multitrillion dollar expenditure would almost certainly rely on selling bonds to foreign countries for financing. I am not comfortable with China, Japan and the European Union controlling the purse strings of our retirement benefits, and neither are the American people.

We should encourage individuals to invest money for retirement, but this should be done outside of Social Security. Social Security was never intended as the only source of income for retirees. It was designed as a safety net to ensure no retiree or disabled person falls into poverty. We simply cannot bet the future of Social Security on a risky privatizing scheme.

Mr. Speaker, let's not make a hasty decision on Social Security that we will live to regret. People have to understand that Social Security is a lifeline for so many of our seniors. When we look at today, the people that are working at minimum wage, when we look where we see pensions not really being there for the American people, we need to certainly make sure that Social Security is there. Widows with children, it is the difference between being able to stay in their home, feed their children or becoming homeless.

People say, well, if we privatize, it will save the government money. In the long run, I honestly don't believe it will. I have too many friends, women friends that have been married or widowed, that never had to work. Now they find themselves with nothing but their Social Security. And it is not even enough to live on, especially in New York.

We must save Social Security.

RAISING AWARENESS ABOUT AUTISM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BILIRAKIS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to bring attention to a disease that has a profound impact on those that it afflicts. Autism, Mr. Speaker, is a bioneurological developmental disability that generally appears before the age of 3. Autism impacts the normal development of the brain in the areas of social interaction, communication skills and cognitive function. Individuals with autism typically have difficulties communicating and interacting with others and often engage in repetitive behaviors.

I spoke on this floor recently about how people with autism are affected by this disease, and the early warning signs of autism that parents should watch for as their infants become toddlers. Today, I want to share with our colleagues the impact that autism has on the families of those that it affects and the struggles parents must endure to raise children with autism.

During a recent district work period, I met several of my constituents, including Howard and Jonica Chittum, and their wonderful son, Mac, who is autistic. They shared with me the emotional and financial challenges of having a child with autism.

The Chittums told me how Mac needs intensive speech and occupational therapy, services for which Medicaid partially pays, but that their health insurance does not. They talked of their excitement when Mac makes progress and of their disappointment when he struggles. The Chittums are fortunate in that they somehow have found time to work and care for Mac.

They also have managed to pay for more intensive therapy for Mac, which has helped him make significant progress in a relatively short time. I was pleased to learn that Mac's language skills are now on age level. His eye contact has improved, and he is showing more interest in other people.

Some people, however, Mr. Speaker, are not as fortunate as the Chittums. I also met with Monica Bice, whose daughter, Jade, has autism, over the district work period. Monica, who met Jonica through a support group for parents of children with autism, wants desperately to provide Jade with the intensive therapy she needs, but simply cannot afford. And Jonica said, "It's just not fair."

I think this is an unconscionable situation that we must remedy, Mr. Speaker.

I am pleased to have cosponsored legislation our colleague from California, Mrs. BONO, has introduced to encourage screening, early intervention and education about autism. This bill, the Combating Autism Act, would strengthen and coordinate all Federal activities related to autism research, diagnosis, screening and treatment.

I think it also is important for parents to know that they are not alone when trying to raise a child with autism. There are a multitude of national, State and local organizations such as Aware for Autism, a support group for parents of children with autism, which Monica started. I encourage anyone who has a child with autism to seek assistance from those who are facing the same challenges that they are.

Mr. Speaker, I believe we can and should do more to raise awareness about autism and encourage its prevention, treatment, and hopefully some day soon, its cure. I urge our colleagues to support the Combating Autism Act and give hope to people with autism and their families and friends.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. BROWN of Ohio addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

TRAGEDY IN INDIA

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman from Washington is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, it is with profound sorrow that I rise to extend my deepest regrets to Prime Minister Manmohan Singh and the people of India over today's deadly attack.

Often on this floor we become very centered in our own events and don't notice what is happening in the rest of the world. I have traveled many times to India. I have enjoyed the company of the Prime Minister. He is a good man and a great leader, and I know that India's best defense in this time of grave trouble is to be led by a man of boundless integrity.

As I speak, far more is unknown than is known about this cowardly act of violence, which occurred today in Mumbai. There is little doubt, however, that the atrocity was carried out by people who worship hatred, because there is no religion on Earth that condones the killing and maiming of innocent people.

I recall the words of the great Indian leader, Gandhi, who wrote, "The most heinous and the most cruel crimes of

which history has record have been committed under the cover of religion and equally noble motives."

Before long, I have little doubt that those responsible will hide behind one of the world's great religions to claim sanctuary for their violence. The world must not be fooled into accepting their claim.

In the words of Gandhi, "Permanent good can never be the outcome of untruth and violence." Weaving a web of lies cannot conceal this one single thread of truth. There is no religion on the planet, not Christianity, not Buddhism, not Islam, or all the others, that preaches or condones hatred.

□ 1600

None do. And only the perversion of a great religious ideal and great historical figures would pretend otherwise. That is done to try to spread more violence.

An atrocity like the one that occurred today in India is done by extremists who are hollow inside. Violence is what they espouse because humanity is what they do not possess. Gandhi said about this violence: "The roots of violence: wealth without work, pleasure without conscience, knowledge without character, commerce without morality, science without humanity, worship without sacrifice, and politics without principles."

The world is filled with problems. No nation is immune. Yet today's bombs and the bullets and the bloodshed will not move the world one step closer to peace. We cannot shoot our way to peace. Those willing to ambush the innocent are not trying to change the world, but they are trying to destroy it.

The world needs people willing to change the world. Change it to produce a blue sky morning, not a world in mourning. Gandhi said: "The difference between what we do and what we are capable of doing would suffice to solve most of the world's problems."

Poverty is a scourge of millions in Africa, and it is not lessened by one single dime by today's violence. The spread of HIV/AIDS that is infecting Africa and now India, millions across India, will not be stopped by the blast of a bomb.

India is a great nation, and the noble spirit of its people will overcome today's heartbreak. The bonds between India and the United States go much deeper than the democracy that we both practice as nations. The personal roots in my hometown of Seattle are deep and strong, and I know we all mourn this terrible loss. We proudly collaborate on so many levels, from trade and economic ties to cultural and charitable exchanges. We have grown close, and the people of Seattle would want me to extend to the people of India our deepest sympathies over this senseless tragedy. I am sure this is true across America.

The truth is wanton violence meant to divide the world can unite it, in sadness today but, to be sure, in strength tomorrow.

I am proud that I was one of the co-founders of the Congressional India Caucus over a dozen years ago. It has grown into a large bipartisan body. When it comes to India today, there really is no political divide in this House. We are very saddened by what has happened, but we are united in offering our support to a nation I am so very proud of.

India, we stand with you.

THE 10TH AMENDMENT TO THE CONSTITUTION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Idaho (Mr. OTTER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. OTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to talk about one of my favorite subjects, and that is the Constitution of the United States. But I want to focus a little bit more today than I generally do and specifically on the 10th amendment to the Constitution.

The 10th amendment to the Constitution, affectionately referred to by most everyone who really reveres the Constitution, would recognize it as the so-called "States' rights amendment." Actually, Mr. Speaker, I have always felt that it was the contract between the States and the creation of the States that we know today as the Federal Government.

Many folks today I believe have it wrong. They think that the Federal Government created the States, whereas, in fact, it was the original 13 States that, in union together, created the Federal Government. And it has always been my long-held belief and opinion that the created can never be greater than the creator in any sense.

And so in my opportunity today, I want to remind the people of that contract between the Federal Government and the States. And it is a simple contract; so perhaps one might suggest that it was never written by a lawyer because it is only 28 words, and it says the powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people.

Now, I may have gotten that a little confused in my enthusiasm, Mr. Speaker; but my enthusiasm for the spirit and the heart of the 10th amendment is undiminished because it was in 1760, when King George III took over for King George II and decided to put even more restraints on the young and upcoming colonies, even more laws and even more regulations, even more taxes and confiscation of their property, it was then only some 16 years later that the 13 colonies finally said we have had enough and we are not going to absorb any more of this abuse from any king, let alone King George III. So history now pretty well has set forth in the agenda the circumstances that took place and finally, of course, after the Declaration of Independence, then after the War of Independence and the creation of the Constitution.

In fact, few people realize today that the Constitution did not include what we know as the Bill of Rights, the first 10 amendments to the Constitution. And it was only as a promise by the States and the Continental Congress that they would at a later time include the Bill of Rights or something to the effect of the Bill of Rights that many of the States then adopted. In fact, during the Continental Congress it was Patrick Henry that said that he refused and would refuse, and he eventually did, to sign the Constitution because he said, I smell a rat. But Lord only knows here was a gentleman that had an olfactory memory that could reach over 200 years out into the future and here we are today.

But I would tell you that Patrick Henry did say that he would not sign the Constitution or agree to it unless it included a Bill of Rights, an enumeration of all the rights of man. And several folks, including one James Wilson, took that under advisement. And they came back several days later, and to the presiding officer at that time, George Washington, they said, Mr. President, we have found it unwise to enumerate all the rights of man for if in our effort to do so we should leave one out, it will have thought to be the property of government; so leave us instead, direct our labors to enumerating the powers and the authorities of government, and if it is not stated, the power and the authority does not belong then to the government.

How wise that was and how wise and respectful we should be and would be today should we honor those kinds of thoughts, should we honor those kinds of limitations, because as we know, including the 10th amendment, each and every amendment of the first 10 amendments was, in fact, a limitation on government. And if you read it time and time again, it always says the Congress shall not, the government cannot, the government will not be allowed.

So I commend to all those who are listening today to get the Constitution out, read those 28 words, and recognize that that is the true contract between this Federal Government in Washington, D.C. and the governments of the 50 States.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MCHENRY). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MCHENRY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. MCHENRY addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

THE BALANCE OF POWER BETWEEN THE STATES AND THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to claim the unused time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman from Utah is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate my good friend from Idaho's having started this process in talking about this particular issue. And I am also looking forward to hearing from my good friend and colleague from New Jersey who will be talking about the 10th amendment in a moment as well. For, indeed, it is one of those central issues that we need to remind ourselves at all times.

In the Federalist No. 32, Hamilton tried to persuade people to ratify the Constitution, and the question was, Would this new government with which we now function have too much power? Hamilton wrote that "I am persuaded that the sense of people, the extreme hazard of provoking the resentments of the State governments, and a conviction of the utility and necessity of local administrations for local purposes would be a complete barrier against the oppressive use of such a power" by the national government. He went on to say that "I affirm that under the plan of the convention," which he was referring to the Constitution of the United States, the States "would retain that authority in the most absolute and unqualified sense and that an attempt on the part of the national government to abridge them in the exercise of it would be a violent assumption of power, unwarranted by any article or clause of" the proposed "Constitution."

Now, in recent times we have strayed slightly from that philosophy. We have in this country today the idea that federalism is not when the central government simply graciously allows the States to do this or that, that it is not that the States are simply another form of administration or level of government. Federalism is when the people of the States set limits on the central government.

It is true that in the name of States' rights that sometimes harm has been done to individuals. One must remember that the idea of the Constitution, of balancing power between the national and State governments, had one purpose and one purpose only, and that was to ensure individual liberties. And when any branch of government, whether it be States or the Federal Government, harms those individual liberties, they are doing an assumption and they are moving boldly from the concept and the process that was originally intended to be there.

Sometimes we forget that back then when the Constitution was established the idea of States' rights or federalism was a given to our Founding Fathers, that those people who wanted to centralize powers were the ones on the defensive at all times and that it was clearly understood that the Bill of Rights, when it was passed, was the way of the States to bind the Federal Government to stay out of certain areas as in "Congress shall make no law," et cetera, et cetera.

The only way to preserve civil liberty, then, is for government to check

its own power, government counter-acting government. And the only way of checking power is to disperse that power and to divide it. The Federal Government will, even though it is against their basic interest, always have to learn to check itself. That is the purpose of federalism. That is the reason there are States and national government. That is why we are here week after week, speech after speech, in some ways trying to pick on issues and prod a conscience to realize the real purpose of federalism has the goal of preserving individual liberty and that when we do that, we are doing good, and that for some reason for the national government, the Federal Government, we here in Washington, if we really want to do well for people, if we want to protect people and their rights, we have to learn to try to limit our own power.

That was the goal of the 10th amendment, and it is the goal of this caucus to try to reemphasize all the time that for the rights of people and to preserve people and to help people, the national government has to lose power and share and balance that power with the States.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I will be looking forward to the comments of my good colleague from New Jersey.

□ 1615

THE MINIMUM WAGE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Maine (Mr. ALLEN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, hard work and perseverance are supposed to be the key to success in America; yet many people who work full time are barely scraping by, earning just \$10,712 per year on the Federal minimum wage, which is now \$5.15 an hour and has been at that level for nearly 10 years.

That is an income, \$10,700, that is \$6,000 below the Federal poverty line for a family of three. That number cheats millions of American families and children out of the chance for basic financial stability every year. It directly contradicts what we often describe as the promise of America, that if you work hard and play by the rules, you have a reasonable chance for a life of some prosperity.

Families are struggling because the buying power of the minimum wage is now at its lowest level in the last 50 years, the last 50 years. But if you look at the changes that families are undergoing just in the last 10 years, here is what you find.

Americans pay 136 percent more to heat their homes and drive their cars than they did 10 years ago when the last minimum wage increase was passed. Health insurance costs have gone up 97 percent during that same period. The cost of a 4-year public university has gone up 77 percent as well.

Families who once lived comfortably on their incomes have been steadily falling out of the middle class and into poverty.

We need to raise the minimum wage from \$5.15 an hour to \$7.25 an hour, a level that will really mean something to the parents who are struggling to provide for their children. An increase would boost the wages of 6.6 million workers directly. Another 8.2 million workers earning up to \$1 above the minimum wage would also get a boost due to the so-called "spillover" effects, and that influence would affect the lives of 54,000 people in my home State of Maine.

Despite what some opponents of a wage hike may claim, wages have not risen significantly on their own. They have been eaten away by inflation. Even though the American workforce has increased its productivity by 14 percent over the last 5 years, real wages have gone up by only 2 percent for nonmanagerial workers.

Meanwhile, the average CEO in America makes more than 1,000 times the minimum wage. Americans CEOs earn in one day what most workers earn in a year.

America prides itself on providing opportunity for all. Yet it is clear that the wealth being generated in our economy is only lifting a few. We need an economic plan that allows our citizens, especially our families and our children, to support themselves, educate themselves and continue to achieve and move forward in their lives.

Now, it frankly is an embarrassment that Congress has not addressed the minimum wage issue in almost 10 years, especially in light of the issues that we have found time to address here. Last week, this body gave an estate tax break worth \$280 billion to a few thousand wealthy individuals. For the past year, the Republican leadership has been intent on giving more tax breaks for the wealthiest 1 percent and paying for it with cuts in education, Medicare, and other programs on which Americans depend to maintain their quality of life.

What does it mean to the average American that Congress has raised its own salary over and over again since 1997, but not the minimum wage? Income inequality in this country is a scandal, and this Congress is contributing to making it greater. This is not only bad for the middle class and lower-income Americans in this country, it is bad for our democracy.

Twenty States, including my home State of Maine, and the District of Columbia have already passed increases in the minimum wage. They understand that this is fundamentally an issue of fairness and good economic sense. We need to see this kind of economic leadership at the Federal level as well. We need economic policies that do not leave the majority of our citizens behind.

The Republican leadership does not want a minimum wage increase to

come to a vote here, but eight in 10 Americans do. They support it. Frankly, I wish this Congress would do as much for the average American as it does for corporations and the wealthiest 1 percent.

The minimum wage must allow workers to earn enough to support themselves and their families. \$5.15 is not enough to live on. I hope we can finally start to work together on this issue and enact a long, long overdue increase in the minimum wage.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. BURTON of Indiana addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

CONGRESSIONAL CONSTITUTION CAUCUS FOCUS ON TENTH AMENDMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. GARRETT) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleagues who came before me this evening to join with us, as we do each Tuesday evening as members of the Congressional Constitution Caucus, to come to the floor to discuss constitutional issues; and this evening to discuss the philosophy, the intent, the foundations of the 10th amendment.

As we discussed, and you have heard already, this amendment really could be said to be the most important amendment in defining what the Founding Fathers' vision of the role of the Federal Government should be.

As stated earlier, the 10th amendment states clearly: "The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people."

These historic words, penned by the Founding Fathers, some of the most ingenious political minds of their time or anytime in the world's history, set forth an important principle: that the Federal Government may exercise specific powers that are listed in the Constitution. All you need to do is simply look to it, for example, article I, section 8, and they enumerate the powers that the Federal Government has. It really does not even go on for more than one-and-a-half pages. These are specific powers that the Federal Government has. The others are the remaining powers that are reserved to the States and the people respectively.

Unfortunately, just as the authors of the Constitution have long passed, so too have many of their foundation principles for our government here. Between an ever-expanding Federal Government that for decades now has crept into many other facets of areas once

left to local control, to a Federal judiciary that in many instances completely ignores the intent of Federalism, all resulting in a Federal Government that has become wildly inefficient and just a huge bureaucracy.

So the old concept is really nothing new. It is just that we have lost it over time. Our founders were very clear when they established our system of government. They intended to set up a republic, a republic really, you could almost say, of sovereign states capable of self-governing, but with a small central government with clearly defined and limited powers.

As someone else previously stated, I think the gentleman from Utah, our Constitution can be thought of as a social contract, a contract between the people and their government. We must think of this most important document as a trade between the rights given up between these competing interests. One of the most important interests that we receive then from the Federal Government, as set forth in the Constitution, is the defense of this Republic.

All other inherently government services, the founders were very clear about, were to be contracts between themselves and the local government and contracts between themselves and the State governments. We refer to this as Federalism. The only powers specifically listed in the Constitution are to be administered by the Federal Government. All others are reserved to the people respectively.

Now, earlier last month, I guess it was, we had the discussion on part of this forum to look at one of the legislations that is coming down the pike that will help facilitate this, and that is the sunset commission. We have discussed this in the past, and I will just talk on it briefly right now.

The sunset commission will try to rein in the Federal Government by looking at the agencies and the powers that are already out there. We have suggested that it could be given, maybe even stronger, be given some teeth to it, and one of the ways you do that is to set it up in a BRAC-like format so that when it comes to Congress, it will actually eliminate those ineffective government programs with an up-or-down vote.

Second, and maybe an important change we can make in this to make it even truer, is to do this, and that is to provide provisions in that legislation to say that you will not simply look at the effectiveness of programs or whether programs are duplicative. You will also look at whether or not the programs of the Federal Government are constitutional.

Even if a program is not duplicative of other Federal programs or State programs, even if a Federal program is effective that is being performed right now, the underlying and most seminal question that we must ask ourselves is, do we, as Members of Congress, have the constitutional authority to do what the legislation is asking us to do.

If you put that into something like a sunset commission, that we can review this as each bill and each legislation comes up, each program that is out there, we will be moving in the right direction.

Let me just close by looking at some of the good news that just came out recently, today as a matter of fact, and that is the economic numbers showing that we are actually reining in Federal spending. We are seeing our deficit go down on the Federal level, and I am happy about that.

I am happy that I have been able to join with other members of this delegation and Members of this House to try to rein in the government and try to bring it in the right direction.

We must be awfully careful, though, that when we get the fiscal house of the Federal Government in order that we do not then decide that we will start spending money elsewhere. That would be the wrong direction to take. We have been able to get to where we are simply by putting our house in order as far as spending; we have been able to lower tax rates, allow folks to be on the family budget and not on the Federal budget, to have a more free-market approach.

So I will just say this: that if we close by putting those limitations on the Federal Government to restrict our approach to it and make sure that our philosophy is the same as the Founding Fathers, then we will see that there is both a practical and a fundamental and foundational approach to doing so, and that is a constitutional government.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. DEFAZIO addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. PALLONE addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. JONES of North Carolina addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gen-

tleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. BURGESS addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. LYNCH) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. LYNCH addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. STUPAK) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. STUPAK addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Georgia (Ms. MCKINNEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. MCKINNEY addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

BLUE DOG COALITION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2005, the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. ROSS) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. ROSS. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the 37-member strong, fiscally conservative, Democratic Blue Dog Coalition, I rise this afternoon to discuss our Nation's debt.

As you can see here, Mr. Speaker, today the United States national debt is \$8,413,298,480,959 and some change. If you divide that enormous number by every man, woman and child, including those babies being born today, every United States citizen's share of the national debt comes to the tune of \$28,120.

In the Blue Dog Coalition we have coined the phrase "the debt tax," not to be confused with the death tax or estate tax. The debt tax, D-E-B-T, is one tax that cannot go away until we get our Nation's fiscal house in order.

That is what the Democratic, fiscally conservative, 37-member-strong Blue Dog Coalition is all about trying to restore some commonsense and fiscal discipline to our Nation's government. As you walk the halls of Congress and as you walk the halls of the Cannon and the Longworth and the Rayburn House Office Buildings, you will come across these posters which signify that you have walked by the door of an office of one of our fellow Blue Dog members.

We are concerned about this because, Mr. Speaker, from 1998 through 2001, this Nation had a balanced budget, and yet under this administration and this Republican-led Congress, we have seen record budget deficits, the largest deficits ever, ever in our Nation's history.

In 2004, the deficit was \$412 billion. In 2005, it was \$318 billion. In 2006, it was \$372 billion, and in fiscal year 2007, it is projected to be \$350 billion, one of the largest deficits ever in our Nation's history.

One of the first bills I filed as a Member of Congress when I got here back in 2001 was a bill to tell the politicians in Washington to keep their hands off the Social Security trust fund. The Republican leadership in this Congress refused to give me a hearing or a vote on that bill, and now we know why, because the real deficit projected for fiscal year 2007 is not \$280 billion or \$350 billion, depending on whose numbers you want to believe. It is really \$545 billion. So where does the difference come about? It is because this Republican Congress and this administration is counting the Social Security trust fund, and that is wrong.

When you and I go to the bank to get a loan, our banker wants to know how we are going to pay it back, when are we going to pay it back, and yet this Republican Congress continues to give us the largest budget deficits ever in our Nation's history while borrowing money from the Social Security trust fund with no provision being made on how or when that money will be paid back.

Where is it going come from? They cannot tell us. When is it going to be paid back? They cannot tell us. Social Security has kept over half the seniors in America out of poverty. It is time for this Republican Congress to keep their hands off the Social Security trust fund.

Now, why is this debt so important? Total national debt from 1789 to 2000 was \$5.67 trillion.

□ 1630

Let me repeat that. From 1789 until 2000, the total national debt was \$5.67 trillion. But by 2010, the total national debt will have increased to \$10.88 trillion. This is a doubling. This is a doubling of the 211-year debt in just 10 years.

Another reason that deficits should matter, Mr. Speaker, is because interest payments on this debt are one of the fastest growing parts of the Federal budget, and the debt tax, D-e-b-t tax, is one that cannot be repealed until we get back to the days of a balanced budget.

Not only is our Nation borrowing \$1 billion a day; this number is going up by about \$1 billion a day. Our Nation is borrowing \$1 billion a day. More important than that, our Nation is spending a half a billion dollars, \$500 million, every single day simply paying interest on the national debt that we already got before it goes up another billion dollars a day.

I represent a very poor district in Arkansas. We have a lot of hope in creating economic opportunities by building new highways. We need \$1.6 billion to complete Interstate 69. It sounds like a staggering number until you

think about it. If we did not have this debt, we could build Interstate 69 with 3 days' interest on the national debt.

Mr. Speaker, our government will spend more money in the next 4 days paying interest, not principal, just interest on the national debt, than what it would cost to completely build Interstate 69 through Arkansas.

Interstate 49 will also be critical to creating economic opportunities and jobs for my district. We need \$1.5 billion to finish it. Again, a staggering number until you think about we are spending \$500 million every 24 hours simply paying interest on the debt we already got before it goes up another billion dollars today.

We could complete Interstate 49 with just 3 days' interest on the national debt. Hot Springs, Arkansas: We need about \$200 million to complete the expressway around Hot Springs. \$80 million to get it up the hill, and up the mountain and another 100 to 200 million to get it back down and totally completed. \$80 million would be nice. \$200 million would be better. We could complete the Hot Springs Expressway with just a few hours' interest on the national debt.

El Dorado, Arkansas, the largest town in my district not located on a four-lane highway, desperately needs four-lane access. We could four-lane U.S. Highway 167 for about \$400 million. Put it another way, we could four-lane U.S. Highway 167 from Little Rock to El Dorado and connect on down to Louisiana to I-20 with less than 1 day's interest on the national debt.

Interstate I-530, \$200 million to complete that project that is also under construction. A lot of money. But just a few hours' interest on the national debt. In fact, Mr. Speaker, we could build 200 brand-new elementary schools every single day in America just with the interest we are spending on the national debt. We cannot meet America's priorities as it relates to reducing our dependence on foreign oil.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, we will spend, we will spend more money in Iraq in the next 8 hours than we will spend on research and development of bio-refineries in the next 365 days.

Health care, education, making the kind of advancements to our Nation's infrastructure that we so desperately need, the kind of investments that we saw under Roosevelt with the WPA program to help get us out of the Great Depression, or with Eisenhower with the interstate program, these kinds of priorities for America will continue to go unmet until we get our Nation's fiscal house in order.

That is why as a member of the Blue Dog Coalition I am here to talk about this debt, and this deficit, because America has many priorities. Many priorities that continue to go unmet as our Nation continues to borrow \$1 billion a day, as our Nation continues to spend half a billion a day, \$500 million a day, simply paying interest on the national debt. Meanwhile, America's priorities continue to go neglected.

Now why should deficits matter other than all of these reasons I have already given you? Deficits reduce economic growth. We all know that. Look how much better the economy was in the 1990s when we had a balanced budget. Deficits burden our children and our grandchildren.

It is wrong for us to borrow money from other countries to give tax cuts to people here earning over \$400,000 a year and leave our children to pay the bill. How would you like to go to the bank and tell your banker you want to borrow money to build this new house, but you are not going to pay for it, you are just going to leave the bills for your children? You know, Mr. Banker, I have got two wonderful children. I am going to make sure they get a wonderful education, grow up, get a good job. They are going to pay for this house. The banker would try to have you locked up as being mentally insane.

Yet that is how we are running our country today. In fact, deficits do matter because they increase our reliance on foreign lenders, foreign lenders who now own over 40 percent of our debt. Where is this money coming from that we are borrowing? 40 percent. As we know, some of it is coming from the Social Security trust fund with no provision on how or when it is going to be paid back.

Well, where is the rest of this debt coming from? We are borrowing \$1 billion a day. Where is it coming from? Is it coming from your hometown bank? I do not think so. It is coming from foreign central banks and foreign investors.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, the United States of America is becoming increasingly dependent on foreign lenders to fund our lifestyle, which is give me tax cuts if I make over \$400,000 a year, borrow the money from China and let my kids worry about paying it back. That is the way this Republican Congress is running America.

Foreign lenders. Foreign lenders currently hold a total of more than \$2 trillion of our public debt. Compare this to only \$23 billion in foreign holdings back in 1993. The top 10 list. The top 10 current lenders. America continues to pass tax cuts for folks earning over \$400,000 a year with money that we are borrowing, because we are borrowing \$1 billion a day, with money they are borrowing from whom? Here is the top 10: Japan, The United States of America owes Japan \$640.1 billion; China, \$321.4 billion. As my friend and a founder of the Blue Dogs, Mr. TANNER, has so eloquently stated and pointed out before, if China decides to invade Taiwan, the United States of America will have to go to China to borrow more money to defend Taiwan.

The United Kingdom, \$179.5 billion; OPEC, imagine that. We wonder why gas is approaching \$3 a gallon. Our Nation has borrowed \$98 billion from OPEC to fund tax cuts for folks in this country earning over \$400,000 a year.

Korea, the United States of America has borrowed \$72.4 billion from Korea;

Taiwan, we have borrowed \$68.9 billion; the Caribbean banking centers, \$61.7 billion; Hong Kong, \$46.6 billion; Germany, \$46.5 billion. And are you ready for this? Rounding out the top 10 countries that our Nation borrows money from to fund our out-of-control deficit spending to the tune of \$1 billion a day, we have now borrowed \$40.1 billion from Mexico.

Now, Mr. Speaker, when an American family sits down around the dinner table to pay their bills and budget for their household, they include all of their family obligations, their mortgage, their car payment, their credit card bills, their education expenses, you name it. Those hardworking folks take into account the cost of a 4-year education for their children, not just for one year of it.

They take into account their car payment, and how many years it is going to take to pay for that car, not just to drive it for a year. When they mortgage their homes, they take into account how long and by what means they will be able to afford their housing, not just live in it for a year.

And you know what, Mr. Speaker, they expect the same from their government. And yet as we can see, July 11, today, Los Angeles Times editorial entitled "Another Mission Accomplished," I am not going to read all of the editorial, but the first two paragraphs are worth reading:

"The release of the White House mid-session budget review is an annual event normally marked by a few wonkish observations and the routine updating of various spreadsheets, not by a full-dress Presidential dog-and-pony show.

"President Bush plans to preside today, with Members of Congress and invited guests in attendance. By all indications, including his own, in his weekly radio address last Saturday, he plans to turn this into a celebration just in time for the fall campaign.

"This is proof, if anyone still needs it, that this administration is desperate for something to boast about. On Mr. Bush's watch, triple-digit budget surpluses have turned into annual triple-digit budget deficits. There is no information in the mid-session report to alter that utterly disparaging fact.

"Yes, the report is expected to project that this year's deficit will be somewhat less gargantuan than last year's, probably somewhere between 280 and \$300 billion versus a \$318 billion shortfall in 2005. That is not much to crow about."

That is an editorial that appeared today in the Los Angeles Times entitled "Another Mission Accomplished." It goes on. But the point is that this administration is so desperate for some good news that they are having a celebration to celebrate that our Nation is not going to borrow \$318 billion as it did in 2005; it is only going to borrow between 280 and \$300 billion in fiscal year 2006. Mr. Speaker, I submit to you that our Nation borrowing nearly \$1 billion a day is nothing to celebrate.

Now, contrary to this administration's rhetoric in light of these new numbers touted today, we have yet to get government spending under control. Instead of talking about 1 year, we should have a real plan to deal with the realities of our long-term debt and deficit, just like American families do for their financial obligations.

A perfect example of this is how we are handling our obligation in Iraq. I believe we all support our troops. I hope we do. I have got a brother-in-law who spent Christmas refueling Air Force planes over in Afghanistan. My first cousin's wife gave birth to their first child during his service in Iraq. We honor all of those who have and who continue to serve our country in Iraq, Afghanistan and elsewhere.

Where I disagree with this President is on the point of accountability. This President, this Republican Congress, is sending \$279 million of your tax money to Iraq every day. And yet if you ask him to be accountable for it, if you ask him for a plan on how that money is being spent and how it will win the peace and ultimately bring our men and women in uniform home, he will tell you you are being unpatriotic. That is where I disagree with this President.

We just entered our fourth year in this war, and I believe if we are going to send \$279 million of your tax money to Iraq every day, this administration and this Republican Congress should be held accountable for how that money is being spent.

But we are still finding it piecemeal; we are still excluding the cost of the war from our annual spending process. We are passing a number of supplemental appropriation bills to pay for it that mask the war's true cost. It is time, it is past time that this administration be up front with the American people and include these important costs in their annual budget estimates.

Only then, Mr. Speaker, only then will we be able to celebrate a real decline in deficits. Again, Mr. Speaker, the U.S. national debt as of today is \$3,413,298,480,959 and some change.

For every man, woman and child in America their share is \$28,120. What is staggering is that by the time we conclude this hour on the floor today, the U.S. national debt will have risen to the tune of more than \$41,666,000.

□ 1645

At this time, Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield to the gentleman from Florida, Mr. ALLEN BOYD, one of the founding members and one of the real leaders of the fiscally conservative 37-member strong Democratic Blue Dog Coalition as we continue to talk more about the debt and the deficit and accountability. Mr. Speaker, I yield to my friend, the gentleman from Florida, Mr. BOYD.

Mr. BOYD. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Arkansas for yielding, and I also want to thank him for his leadership. He has led these

special orders for the Blue Dog Coalition now for quite a while on a weekly basis to try to deliver the message to the American people in an honest and straightforward way about the fiscal situation of our Nation's government.

Mr. Speaker, I was glad to hear him talk a little bit about Iraq. Iraq is a situation that we are having a great debate in this country about, and I think that he made the point that we all very strongly support the men and women. Once we established the mission and sent them over there to perform and carry out that mission, it is clear that we support them. It doesn't mean that we can't have an honest and open dialogue and debate about the policy.

Mr. Speaker, is appalling to me as a person who wore the uniform during the Vietnam era to see those Members of the House of Representatives and the U.S. Senate, or anybody that might oppose the policy that the United States Government has, to have them called unpatriotic. So I appreciate the gentleman from Arkansas bringing up that point.

I also, Mr. Speaker, came here today to talk a little bit about fiscal responsibility and to assist my friend from Arkansas in talking about the national debt. Mr. Speaker, I find it appalling to hear the partisan political rhetoric that goes on in these Chambers, rhetoric which celebrates a Federal budget annual deficit of \$300 billion.

Now, most of us that have run a business, Mr. Speaker, know that at the end of the day your revenues have to match your expenditures, or else you either have to borrow money with a long-term plan to pay it back, or a short-term plan and show your banker how you can pay it back that year.

Mr. Speaker, this administration and this Republican-led Congress over the last 5 years have run our government into a situation where we have a structural deficit built in. There is not an economist anywhere around that will tell you under the current revenue taxing system and the current spending habits of this Congress and this administration that we will have a balanced budget anywhere in the future. We all know that we have to make some structural changes to the way we are doing business. So when I see somebody celebrating a \$300 billion annual deficit, it saddens me in a lot of ways.

What Mr. Ross and the other members of the Blue Dog Coalition want for the American people is an effort by this Congress and this administration to address our fiscal situation honestly. Honestly, Mr. Speaker. What is wrong with telling the American people what the true fiscal situation is as it relates to our Federal Government?

We would like to see the Treasury's financial report that Mr. Ross made mention of earlier in his comments that is published by the Government Accounting Office and accounts for all spending, current and future. Had we seen this report last year, it would

have told us that the Federal budget actually was \$760 billion, not \$350 billion as reported. And do you know what, ladies and gentlemen? It won't change much this year.

The Blue Dogs would like to see an earnest effort to institute commonsense principles in our budgeting process, just principles which every businessman and businesswoman in this country understands that you have to live by if you are going to have a successful business. In our Federal budgeting process, those would translate into discretionary spending caps, something that in 1997, when I first came to this Congress working together with Republicans and Democrats.

Working together, we had a Democratic President, we had a Republican-controlled House and Senate; they all sat at the table together, and they talked honestly with each other, and they laid the numbers out on the table, "Here is where we are; here is what it will take to get us back into balance." Discretionary spending caps. Put some caps on spending. Use the PAYGO rule.

What does PAYGO mean? A PAYGO rule means that if you are going to spend something over here, that you have to find a place either to cut spending on this side or raise the revenue from some source. If you are going to decrease revenue over here through a tax cut, you are going to have to find a place to raise that revenue someplace else. Those are commonsense PAYGO rules. That way we won't be taking spending more than we are taking in.

Something, Mr. Speaker, that we voted on the first 4 years I was in this Congress, I think we voted on it no less than seven or eight times, and that is a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution, a constitutional balanced budget amendment which requires us, as a Congress and administration, to balance our budget.

It seems that we don't have the political will under the current leadership to make these tough decisions from a legislative or an executive branch, so maybe it is time to consider a constitutional requirement that would force the Congress and the administration to balance this budget. If we don't, we will continue to see that number of \$8,413,298,480,959 continue to go up.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Ross may not know this, but when I came to the Congress in 1997, that number was less than \$5.5 trillion. It has gone up over \$3 trillion since I came here. It was \$5.6 trillion when President Bush was elected and took office in January of 2001. So it has gone up about \$2.8 trillion since this President came into office.

Again, Mr. Speaker, I find it appalling that the political rhetoric would cause us to celebrate a \$300 billion annual deficit. That is over 10 percent of our Federal budget, over \$300 billion, over 10 percent of our Federal budget. We have to go out into the capital markets, and Mr. Ross has done a good job of explaining where those capital mar-

kets are, in China and Japan and Mexico and other countries.

In years past, those deficits were financed locally, mostly by war bonds and other bonds that were sold domestically, but not anymore. And I think that would lead us into a situation which could be very dangerous for us from an economic standpoint and a national security standpoint.

In addition to the things that I have talked about that I would like to see, the Blue Dogs would like to see implemented into a budgeting process, and that is discretionary spending caps, PAYGO rules, balanced budget amendment, we would like to see the government act responsibly like most every responsible family in America and save for emergencies.

We are always going to have emergencies, we are always going to have a hurricane or a tornado or an earthquake or a flood, or we are always going to be engaged somewhere around the world in a military action. Why not set up a rainy day fund for future emergencies and put money into it so that we won't have to, on an annual basis and sometimes even more than once a year, come back to the appropriations process and pass an off-book emergency spending bill?

Why do we do that? Well, again, I think it has to do with partisan politics, and that is, if you pass a budget originally which pretends that you can live within your means, but you know you have left off a lot of things, you might fool some people, but you are not going to fool many people for very long.

Mr. Speaker, I spoke earlier about what happened in 1997 shortly after I came to Congress in which we all sat together, Republicans, Democrats, House leaders, Senate leaders, sat together and developed a long-term plan to get us out of our Federal debt or out of annual deficits and put us into a balanced budget. We did that, and guess what. Once we put that plan in place, everybody bought into it, the economy continued to grow.

The economy in America has always grown. I mean, if things are even halfway normal, you are going to have more tax revenues the next year than you had the previous year.

So that is part of the partisan rhetoric that is appalling to me, that the numbers that the White House has thrown out in the last few days in terms of the growth in tax revenues is way below what they projected in 2001 when they presented their economic package, which included the large book of tax cuts.

So I think that it is really important to work together and deal honestly with the American people about what our situation is, and we can't really begin to solve this problem until we recognize in an honest way what the problem is.

Now, Mr. Ross earlier talked about the article in the Los Angeles Times today, which really I would commend

to our viewers, to those who are listening to us, to read. And it talks a little bit about this budget deficit and the current economic news. But let me quote from that, if I might, Mr. Speaker.

In that article, the writer says, "This will be the third year in a row that the administration put forth relatively gloomy deficit forecasts early, only to announce much later that things had turned out better than expected." That is what you have here. You see, back in the early spring when we first put the budget on the table, there were some very gloomy reports about what that number would be and now this is the third year that that has happened.

"To some skeptics," and I continue to quote, "it is beginning to look like an economic version of the old expectations game. Even economists who hesitate to accuse the White House of playing games," and I am still quoting from this L.A. Times article, "Even economists who hesitate to accuse the White House of playing games say the claims of good news on the budget are unfortunate because they make people unjustifiably sanguine about the government's current fiscal health."

"Our problem," and this is a quote from Comptroller David Walker who is a man that we all know and respect, those of us who serve here representing our constituents back home. He says, and I quote, "Our problem is our long-term—our large long-term deficit, and the sooner we deal with that, the better."

Walker also goes on to say that, and he warns of, quote, "a false sense of security. We are in much worse shape fiscally today than we were a few years ago."

This is from a man who is the head accountant representing the United States Government Accounting Office.

Mr. Speaker, I know we have been joined by some other Blue Dog members, and we want to hear from them, but I want to commend the gentleman from Arkansas for leading this discussion tonight. It is important, Mr. Speaker, that we have an honest debate and dialogue on these issues.

A constituent told me one time, he said, "Mr. Boyd, we used to hear debate and dialogue, but now we hear spin and rhetoric. Can we get back to honesty? Can we get back to everybody at least laying out both sides of the issue so that we can understand better how to fix these problems?"

We can't really fix them until we admit that we have a problem. And for some in this government, they don't seem willing to admit that we have a problem. So I want to commend the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. ROSS. I thank the gentleman from Florida, one of the leaders of the Democratic Blue Dog Coalition, for joining us this evening and addressing part of the Blue Dog's 12-point reform plan for curing our Nation's addiction to deficit spending. And these are just 12 commonsense ideas that we offer up,

and yet the Republican leadership refuses to give us a hearing or a vote on these ideas.

□ 1700

One of them is simply a balanced budget. Forty-nine States require a balanced budget. I can assure you my wife requires a balanced budget at the Ross home in Prescott, Arkansas. Most bankers require businesses to have a balanced budget. And this is just another commonsense idea we have.

Another of the 12-point plans for budget reform simply says, "Ensure that Congress reads the bills it is voting on." Now, we can't pass a law to make Congress read the bills it is voting on, but I can promise you this: When this Congress votes on 500-plus-page bills and gives the minority, our side of the aisle, less than an hour to read the bill before we vote on it, I can promise you that Members of Congress cannot read every word of every page of every bill before they are being forced to vote on it.

We saw that happen, for example, with the Medicare prescription drug bill, now estimated to cost \$720 billion over the next 10 years. It went to a vote barely a day after the final version of the 500-plus-page bill was made available for Members of Congress to see and read.

What we propose, as members of the Blue Dog coalition, is that Members of Congress should be given a minimum of 3 days to have the final text of legislation made available to them before there is a vote. Another commonsense idea.

I want to thank again the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BOYD) for joining us and raising some of these things, because we are not here just to say Republicans are bad. We are here to say we are tired of all the partisan bickering that goes on in our Nation's Capital. It shouldn't be about whether it is a Republican idea or a Democrat idea; we want to see some commonsense ideas.

And we are not here just to criticize. We are here to hold the Republican Congress accountable, but we are also here to offer up a solution to this problem, and that is why we have written this 12-point plan for budget reform.

At this time, I am pleased to introduce one of the newest members of the Blue Dog coalition, who has contributed greatly to our calls of trying to restore common sense and fiscal discipline to our Nation's government. Before I do that, though, Mr. Speaker, if you have any comments or concerns of us, I hope you will e-mail us at bluedog@mail.house.gov. Again, Mr. Speaker, if you have any comments, questions, or concerns of us, I would encourage you to e-mail us at bluedog@mail.house.gov.

And at this time, I am now pleased to turn this over to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. BEAN).

Ms. BEAN. I thank my colleague, Mr. ROSS, from Arkansas, for allowing me

to join him in what I hope will be a colloquy with some of our other Blue Dog members. Congressmen BOYD and DAVIS and TANNER, I think, are going to join us, as well, and we can talk about some of the issues that are so important to all of us that are part of the Blue Dog Coalition.

One of the things I would like to lead on is the PAYGO budget rules that we all feel are so important to restore honesty in government and with our taxpayers, so they understand how we are spending their tax dollars better.

One of the other things I want to do before we even go there is, I would like to ask Mr. TANNER to talk a little about his bill that he has introduced to create better auditing of those Federal agencies where we know there is a lack of controls.

Mr. TANNER. Well, thank you very much. I am delighted to join Mr. DAVIS, and you, Ms. BEAN, and Mr. ROSS and Mr. BOYD.

I became aware of the fact that there is no oversight in this town of what we are already removing from people's pockets involuntarily in terms of taxation, and appropriating it to any administration without any oversight about where it is going.

To give you some instances, this is hard to believe, and we have had to get these from newspaper reports and IG reports and so forth because there have been no oversight hearings to amount to anything around here in so long, but just listen to some of these examples of government waste:

An internal Pentagon audit found that Halliburton had overcharged the American taxpayer by over \$1 billion. This included \$45 for cases of Coke, \$100 a bag for laundry service, and several months preparing at least 10,000 daily meals at a military base in Iraq that the troops did not eat. They also paid a Kuwaiti company \$1.30 a gallon of gasoline, while other contractors were doing work for 18 cents a gallon.

This goes on. The Multinational Security Transition Command purchased seven armored Mercedes-Benz automobiles at \$945,000 a car, over \$6.6 million, that ended up being old models and did not even have the required level of armored protection. Furthermore, they couldn't locate one of them after delivery was made.

FEMA paid \$236 million for three cruise ships to house evacuees and relief workers in the wake of Hurricane Katrina. This comes out to over \$1,200 a week per passenger at full capacity, almost double the price of a weeklong cruise. The ships did not have any fuel costs or entertainment costs because they were at the dock. Also, the ships have never been at capacity, but FEMA's contract pays them for capacity anyway.

They are also paying contractors in the gulf coast an average of \$2,480 for less than 2 hours of work to cover each damaged roof with a blue tarp, which is 10 times what the temporary fix would normally cost.

We had to get these reports from newspaper accounts and others because there is no oversight here.

So what we have done is, we have put together a bill, H. Res. 841, which the Blue Dogs have endorsed, that says basically three things: When the Inspector General report identifies waste, fraud, and abuse, or when they identify a "high-risk agency," which is government talk for one that doesn't work, the program is not working like Congress intended it to, or when the CPAs, or the auditor, says on the front page of the audit that we don't know if what you are about to read is true or not because the books are in such bad shape we can't audit them, in those cases, this bill that the Blue Dog Coalition has endorsed says basically that Congress must hold a hearing.

It is our, the Blue Dogs' position that at least the American taxpayer ought to expect from this Congress or any other Congress to keep up with the money we take away from people involuntary in the form of taxes. This Congress is not doing that, and it is a failure; it is a total abdication really of the constitutional responsibility that this branch of government has to the executive branch.

So I hope people will get interested in H. Res. 841, because it speaks directly, Ms. BEAN, to what you were talking about.

Ms. BEAN. Well, I am honored to have cosponsored that legislation. And to your point, I think it is basic fiscal common sense. The taxpayers deserve better than what they are getting from this Congress. I can't imagine anyone who would call themselves a fiscal conservative and not support this commonsense legislation or any leadership that wouldn't bring such legislation forward.

Mr. ROSS. I want to thank the gentleman from Tennessee, one of the founders of the fiscally conservative Democratic Blue Dog Coalition, Mr. TANNER, for offering up this bill. Again, another example of how the Blue Dogs are not just pointing fingers. We are holding the Republican Congress accountable, but we are not just criticizing them. We are offering up solutions, and this is another commonsense solution to restore accountability to our government.

A lot of people may not know this, but the Government Accountability Office reported that 19 of 24 Federal agencies were not in compliance with all Federal accounting audit standards and could not fully explain how they had spent taxpayer money appropriated by Congress. This bill that the Blue Dogs and Mr. TANNER have introduced will hold these Federal agencies accountable for how they spend your tax money, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. BOYD. Would the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROSS. Yes, I will yield to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BOYD).

Mr. BOYD. I just wanted to comment on the presentation, the remarks by

Mr. TANNER, who has been a champion on this accountability effort.

And you remarked or just talked about the audits, that 19 of the 24 agencies couldn't produce clean audits. Actually, the leaders, the worst offender is probably the Department of Defense. FEMA is a bad offender. We have hurricanes in Florida all the time, so we are always dealing with FEMA. I can tell you that I can take you to some folks, many, many folks who are millionaires that were getting generators, that were getting their roofs fixed, and things like that from FEMA.

And this goes back to the accountability issue. What are we doing with the taxpayers, the folks we are taking money from involuntarily, as Mr. TANNER says? We have some responsibility to make sure, and that responsibility belongs to the United States Congress, to make sure the executive agencies are spending it wisely, and we are not doing that. And that is the point we are making here. And I thank you for yielding.

Mr. ROSS. The gentleman raises an excellent point. As you can see here, these are manufactured homes. You would think that they would be in Louisiana or Mississippi or someplace where people lost their homes and everything they owned as a result of Hurricane Katrina. And you would have thought, well, the hurricane was last August, and this is July, so we are coming up on the first anniversary, and you would think they would have by now gotten to the people who have been left homeless from these storms.

Yet they have remained parked, you can see, in this cow pasture here, or hay meadow here, or whatever you want to call it. There is the barbed wire fence, and the grass, and the pasture land, and 10,777 of these manufactured homes. These are 16-foot wide, 60-foot long, and almost a \$500,000,000 worth of mobile homes sitting at the Hope Airport in Hope, Arkansas.

These trailers, 10,777 of them, arrived late last year. Today, we still have 9,959 of them. That is a close-up view. You have to see this. Hopefully, Mr. Speaker, you can get a good look at this. That is an aerial view. They are being parked at the airport in Hope, Arkansas.

That is not all of them. Lord knows, there is not a lens wide enough to get them all. But we still have 9,959 brand-new, fully-furnished, totally unused mobile homes that were designed to go to storm victims following Hurricane Katrina that are parked 450 miles from the eye of the storm at an airport in Hope, Arkansas.

Now, if that is not enough, FEMA is spending \$250,000 a month, \$25,000 of that is going to the city to park them there, but the rest of that \$250,000 a month is going for security and all the maintenance and all the stuff that is required to store them there. And on top of that, FEMA's response is not to get them to the people who need them, FEMA's response is, oh, my goodness,

the inspector general is right. When a big rain comes, they are likely to sink in this hay meadow. So now FEMA is spending another \$7 million laying gravel on nearly 200 acres of land.

This is the kind of lack of accountability within our government that we are trying to get at with this bill Mr. TANNER and the other Blue Dogs have introduced.

Mr. TANNER. If you will yield on just that point, here is what the Office of Inspector General for the Department of Homeland Security, which is where FEMA is now, said in regard to their financial statements. "Unfortunately, the Department made little or no progress to improve its overall financial reporting during FY 2005. The auditor was unable to provide an opinion on the Department's balance sheet."

What they are saying is, we don't know what these people are doing with this money and they can't tell us. Congress is not asking, what did you do with the money, but if they asked, they couldn't tell them. That is what this bill goes to, and I am glad you have that horrendous picture there about all these trailers.

They can't tell you and the auditor can't tell you what happened to the money.

Mr. ROSS. I want to thank the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. TANNER).

At this time, I would like to introduce another gentleman from Tennessee who is very active in the fiscally conservative Democratic Blue Dog Coalition, another member who is not afraid to come to Washington, stand up and say he is a conservative Democrat, and that is my friend, Mr. LINCOLN DAVIS from Tennessee.

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Congressman ROSS, thank you for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, it is an honor to be here today to talk about our wonderful country. I have traveled some recently, and as I have traveled to other areas, basically in the war zone in Afghanistan and Iraq, I realize one of the greatest blessings I have had was at birth.

I was born in America, and to be an American citizen as a result of that, with all the hopes and all the opportunities and options of life any human being could expect to be given in this country. Some of those opportunities are, for folks like me, who live in a rural area, in a very small area, lowly populated, that one could also have an opportunity to run for Congress; and I took that opportunity in 2002 and ran and was elected.

I came to Washington knowing what the challenges were. I came to Washington realizing that a lot of times we see and hear a lot of smoke and mirrors, that transparency seems to be something that doesn't exist a whole lot, but I didn't really think we were going to hear of some of the things that have happened in this Congress.

The lack of oversight, the lack of hearings on how we spend our money,

the lack of hearings on the war in Iraq, and the lack of hearings on virtually anything. We are almost shut down unless it happens to be the idea of the majority in this Congress. Debate is limited to just what they choose to talk about.

That is not the America I knew growing up. That is not the America I want us to have today. So I want to talk some about fiscal irresponsibility.

□ 1715

For years I heard Democrats being called tax and spend liberal Democrats. It became a buzzword, something that most folks didn't like, including me. But after I got here, I realized we needed to change that phrase. It needed to be changed to borrow and spend liberals, borrow and spend liberals, and mismanagement and spend liberals. Those are Republicans that I am talking about folks, not Democrats. Because during the Clinton administration when President Clinton left office in 2001, the deficit of this Nation was a little over \$5 trillion. Today it is \$8.4 trillion.

Also the Clinton administration gave this President over \$230 billion in surplus that could be used to start paying down the debt. Let's take \$200 billion in surplus. Over the last 5 years, that is a trillion dollars we could have paid down on our debts. Instead, what have we done? We have gone from \$5.3 trillion to \$8.4 trillion. That is a \$3.1 trillion increase.

Just think, if we had managed government as it was managed during the 1990s, with budget restraints in place, similar to the ones that the Blue Dogs are trying to get passed, those 12-point items, think of where we would be today if we continued with \$230 billion in surplus. We would be \$1.25 trillion less in debt. We would now owe a little over \$4 trillion instead of \$8.4 trillion.

Whose fault is it? It is the mismanagement of this group. How is that the case? Because during the Clinton administration, during the last years it was 18.4 percent in gross domestic product that was being spent at that time under the budget restraints that we lived under, pay as you go. Today it is 20.1 percent, the gross domestic product.

Let me repeat those figures. The last year of the Clinton administration, it was 18.4 percent of the gross domestic product that America was spending on government. In this administration for the last 5 years, it has grown, the gross domestic product, numbers have increased obviously because we have seen the gross domestic product increase, but the number is 20.1 percent.

Does that tell you that somebody is fiscally conservative? It doesn't to me. Folks talk about commonsense approaches. Commonsense to me is the application of knowledge based upon your experiences of life.

We have too many blue blood trust fund owners in this Chamber that don't understand how to manage money. If

you have that trust fund, you don't need to worry about where your next dollar is coming from. It is coming from the labors and fruits of your parents or grandparents and the blue blood trust fund boys and girls in here don't know how to figure out how to balance the budget. Some of us have had to work all of our lives, and we know when you spend that hard-earned tax dollar of those that we are extracting it from, that it is a sacrifice from them.

It is my hope that this Congress wises up and stops being as partisan as they quite frankly have been and start addressing the issues in a transparent way with oversight and accountability.

Ms. BEAN. Mr. Speaker, I think Congressman DAVIS makes a fine point because I think it is one of the reasons so many of our constituents feel disconnected from Washington. They cannot relate to what is going on in the Hill. Most of us come from a real-world background. We have run businesses, and we have certainly run our personal finances in such a way that you could never manage the way we are mismanaging our Federal dollars.

We are now borrowing \$26 billion per month. That is an outrageous figure, and it is highly irresponsible. As a result, we are spending \$15 billion per month just on interest payments alone. There are so many good works we could be doing in government if we were not being so fiscally irresponsible. This is reckless borrow and spend profligacy.

To go back to what Congressman ROSS mentioned, those mobile homes were well-intended to help people who needed temporary housing in the aftermath of Hurricane Katrina. Are those being utilized? No. We don't as a Congress historically look back. We are not using legislation like Congressman TANNER's to audit and use performance measurement criteria, to see that if we are going to make the investment in those mobile homes, someone is actually going to live in them.

The concept of return on investment, something in the business world that we live by, is just absent from this Congress. The American public expects us to do a better job in that regard.

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. So what you are saying is that we need an audit of America, just like we would our businesses.

Ms. BEAN. That is exactly right.

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. I agree with Congressman TANNER on that. Just audit America and we will figure out what the problems are.

Mr. BOYD. Mr. Speaker, I think it is important for our people back home to understand that Congress appropriates the money for the executive agencies to spend. Of course the President has to sign those appropriations bills and put them into law and then the executive agency spends that money. But it is inherent upon us, and the framers of the Constitution presumed, that Congress would then provide oversight to

make sure that the executive agencies were spending the money like it was designed to be spent by Congress or desired to be spent and not wasting it and that is where we have gone wrong with this.

It could have happened maybe with the other side, but you have one party controlling the White House, the House and the Senate; and the House and the Senate seem to have just abdicated their oversight responsibility.

Why couldn't we have hearings to find out about those six Mercedes and over \$6 million? Why couldn't we have hearings to find out about the FEMA mismanagement?

The Department of Defense is the worst. There is an article that was published in Vanity Fair this month that I could commend that talks about some of the corruption going on in this government. And the reason for that it basically says is because Congress has abdicated its oversight responsibility, and in many cases the Department of Defense has been complicit in just allowing these things to go on without asking the tough questions.

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. When you talk about our national defense, I want to talk about Iraq. In Iraq, the maximum petroleum that was being produced in Iraq was 3.5 million barrels a day. That is over a billion barrels a year. At \$70 a barrel, it has been running \$60 to \$70 a barrel for the last year almost, you are talking about \$60 billion to \$70 billion. Where is that money going, Mr. President? Where is that money going, Mr. Secretary of Defense? Where is that money being spent? Are we producing that as we told the American public we would be?

I understand it is down to a million and a half barrels; but even at that, we are still talking in terms of \$30 billion to \$40 billion. Why are we still sending money to help rebuild Iraq?

I think there are many things that we need oversight on, and the mismanagement that we are seeing of this administration and of this Congress is something that every American ought to be screaming about today.

Mr. ROSS. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. DAVIS), the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. TANNER), the gentleman from Illinois (Ms. BEAN), and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BOYD) for joining me for this Special Order this evening.

Mr. Speaker, we are here to demonstrate that if given the opportunity as Democrats, we are prepared and ready to lead this Nation. We are prepared to lead this Nation in restoring fiscal responsibility and accountability to our government. We are not just here to point out what is wrong with this Republican administration and Republican Congress. We are here to offer up real commonsense solutions to fix these things.

We have talked about them in the last hour, the 12-point reform plan for curing our Nation's addiction to deficit

spending through budget reform. We have talked about Mr. TANNER's bill, House Resolution 841, to require congressional hearings when a Federal Office of Inspector General report documenting fraud, waste, abuse or mismanagement in the government results in a cost to the government of at least \$1 million.

We have talked about the need for other ideas that we have that we are advancing, like the idea of the gentleman from California (Mr. CARDOZA) with H.R. 5315, a bill that would require a Federal agency to produce an audit within 2 years that complies with the standards established in the Federal Financial Management Improvement Act of 1996. If they can't do that, the Senate would hold reconfirmation hearings on any Cabinet-level official whose agency cannot fully account for its spending within 2 years.

Mr. Speaker, this past hour has been about accountability. It has been about our government being accountable for every tax dollar it spends.

Mr. Speaker, as members of the Blue Dog Coalition, we are ready, willing and able to lead this Congress if given the opportunity.

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. We call this the Blue Dog Coalition, not Blue Dog Democrats. We are all Democrats, but we invite the Republicans to join us so we can bring some sense to this fiscal irresponsibility. I hope some Republicans will join this coalition because it is not limited just to Democrats. Most Blue Dogs are conservative Democrats, at least when it comes to fiscal matters. And we are also hawks on defense spending, so we invite Republicans to join us.

Mr. ROSS. I appreciate the gentleman making that point. We would welcome Republicans to join us. We would welcome an opportunity for Republicans to give us a hearing and a vote on these bills that we are trying to submit to restore some fiscal discipline and commonsense to our national government.

ILLEGAL IMMIGRATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MCHENRY). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2005, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I very much appreciate the profound honor to address you in this Chamber. It is a privilege that has been experienced by only a small number of Americans throughout the years.

I come to the floor this afternoon and evening to address the issues that are important to us today. I intend to bring up the issues that have to do with our border control, border security and enforcement of our Nation's laws, and to talk about the facts behind them, the reasons that the American people clearly see this issue as a necessity for enforcement, and the reasons why establishing a guest worker/

temporary worker plan in the middle of an unknown set of circumstances with regard to enforcement simply has too many hypotheticals involved in it to be able to build a good logical plan.

And to make that case, I would state that there are times in one's life when we are called upon to make large decisions, decisions that have tremendous impact, decisions that reflect and echo across through the generations. It might be the generations of our family, it might be the generations of our neighborhood. In this case, we are talking about the generations of Americans for a long time to come.

There are two opposing competing forces in this immigration field today. One of them is this powerful force that is the heart and soul of the center of America, that we need to enforce the laws that we have. We need to control our borders. We can't be a Nation if we don't have a border, and we can't call ourselves a Nation if we don't enforce our border.

That is something that is a basic fundamental that the American people know. They may not sit down and articulate it every day. They may not actually intellectualize it. They may not go back and read all of these immigration laws that we have. They may not look back and see the responsibility we have constitutionally to establish immigration laws here in this Congress. They may not do all that. They might just have a subliminal sense that is what we should do because it is common sense; it makes sense. To some it is in their gut instead of their brain, but they can trust their gut because their instincts are right on this.

They understand we have to enforce the laws here in America; and if we don't do that, we won't be forever America. That is the position on the enforcement side. That is in one corner of this prize fight debate going on across America.

In the other corner are the people that say that they are for a policy for guest worker, temporary worker. They are for a policy of amnesty by any other name, but amnesty. They have been seeking for years now to redefine the term "amnesty." You can look it up in the dictionary, but the definition I keep being told I should accept is the argument of what would not be amnesty. It would not be amnesty if someone came into this country, broke the law to come in here and broke the law to stay here, and they stayed here a long time, 5 years or more. Their roots went down. They made some money. They sent a lot back to their home country. They started a family. Maybe they bought some property. Maybe they are a valuable employee to an important business that is in the community. They sent their roots down.

Now, they are law breakers. Whether they overstayed their visa or whether they jumped the border illegally, they broke the law. So then the argument is it isn't amnesty if you just say to them we think you are a pretty good citizen,

other than the fact that you broke the law. We would like to just give you amnesty, but in order to avoid this argument, because we know Americans reject the idea and the concept and the real definition of amnesty, we are going to redefine it. So if you just pay a fine of \$1,500 or \$2,000, or the Senate kind of ratcheted it up in some cases to as much as \$3,200, if you just pay the fine, that takes care of your punishment.

□ 1730

So it is no longer going to be amnesty because you have paid a price for breaking the law. I would submit, Mr. Speaker, that it is not necessarily so much as pay the price as that it puts these people on a path to citizenship.

The Senate language does that. The path to citizenship is an objective that is more than was asked for by the people who came here illegally. Many of them just wanted to work here and make money and send their money back home, or save money and go back to their home country and perhaps retire. But we are offering them the plum of citizenship for a price. And the price is maybe \$1,500 or \$2,000 or \$3,000 or \$3,200. But citizenship for a price.

And that price, I believe, is cheap; and I think it cheapens the citizenship. Citizenship should be sacred. It should be precious, and it is to those who are Americans by choice, who got in line, waited long years to come into the United States, came here, learned to speak English, learned to write English, learned about our history, learned about our culture, learned about our civilization and went through that process of naturalization and became Americans by choice, naturalized American citizens.

And I have had the privilege to speak at a number of those naturalization services in my district. And those are some very, very proud days for me, Mr. Speaker, but they are far more, as far as proud days are concerned, for the naturalized citizens. That is a highlight of their life. And in their lifetime, of the things that matter to them, the day of the citizenship ceremony stands out. It stands out and maybe stands with the day they get married perhaps, maybe the day of their first-born child, those kinds of milestones in life.

The naturalization service and ceremony is a milestone that stands with the very finest events in our lifetimes. And so those people that came here and became naturalized citizens, they don't want to see amnesty for people who jumped the border to get here or broke the laws to stay here. They know what amnesty is, and they don't want to see their citizenship cheapened by having it for sale, putting it up for a \$1,500, \$2,000 or \$3,200 check.

What price citizenship for America? Priceless. But you have to demonstrate that you are going to respect the laws and live by the rule of law.

And so, some time back, I went to a groundbreaking ceremony for a, it was

an \$81 million expansion of a plant in my district. There was an individual there who was protesting me, and his signs said things such as, I am a former or a current illegal immigrant, and I believe that we ought to give amnesty to these people that are here illegally, and they should have a path to citizenship—different phrases to express what I have just said.

And so I find out afterwards that he is not shy about saying he is also a former illegal immigrant who was granted amnesty in the 1986 amnesty that was signed by Ronald Reagan.

So here is an individual who jumped the border, came here illegally, living presumably in the shadows. 1986 rolled around, and by the stroke of a pen over at the White House, he and more than 3 million others received amnesty. Now he is out protesting in the streets, declaring that 10 or 12 million or, more appropriately, 60 to 90 million people should have the same path to citizenship that he achieved by the stroke of a Presidential pen 20 years ago. And he is advocating that people break the law, jump the border, come here and make demands on American taxpayers and demands for a path to United States citizenship after they have shown contempt for the laws of the United States of America.

And their first act was to break the law of the United States of America. The very first moment they set foot on this soil across that border, they broke American law. And they march in the streets and demonstrate in the streets, with flags from other countries often, and argue that they are not criminals.

But I would submit, Mr. Speaker, that if they cross the border illegally, they are guilty of a criminal misdemeanor. By definition, it is a criminal misdemeanor punishable by less than a year in jail. I think it is 6 months, actually. But that is a criminal misdemeanor. That makes them criminals if they are guilty of this crime.

It isn't the Congress that has passed a law in H.R. 4437 that makes them criminals. That would make them felons. And they are arguing that they are not criminals.

Yes, they are. They are criminals. They haven't been adjudicated to be criminals yet, but they admit to their criminal action. They just say, don't call me a criminal.

Well, respect our laws, please. And if you do that and you don't break our laws, then we won't call you a criminal. And, in fact, we wouldn't be moving legislation that would identify felons either by that standard, Mr. Speaker.

And so people who are granted amnesty, who have broken our laws, have contempt for the rest of our laws because they have profited from breaking our laws. And that is the wrong kind of reward. If we reward lawbreakers with citizenship, what are you going to get? More lawbreakers.

The same Ronald Reagan that only let me down about twice in 8 years in

office, and I have mentioned one of those times. That same Ronald Reagan said, what you tax you get less of. What you subsidize you get more of. And you know if you subsidize law-breaking you are going to get more law-breaking. Mr. Speaker, not less. You aren't going to be able to draw a line in the sand and say now we are not going to tolerate any more law-breaking.

There is no will in this country right now within the administration to enforce the laws we have. And the White House is working against the laws that we are trying to pass asking for more enforcement. And they are working with MCCAIN, KENNEDY, HAGEL and MARTINEZ over in the Senate, working on their version of amnesty, saying we are for this. We are opposed to amnesty, but we think we ought to be giving people a path to citizenship who broke the laws to come here. They just should have to do this rigorous process of moving towards American citizenship and finding this path to citizenship, and it includes learning English and keeping a job and paying some of your taxes.

That sounds like a lot, doesn't it? Paying some of your taxes should give you a path to citizenship, not all of your taxes, some of your taxes, 3 out of the last 5 years. You pick the 3 years to pay the taxes in.

Well, I would like to be able to do that. I had a couple of good years out of the last 5. I would like to take those out and say, send me my money back, Uncle Sam. That was a little tough on me. And I want to do this. If we are going to give this to people who broke the laws to come here and who aren't paying any taxes, to offer them, you pick the lowest 3 out of the last 5 years and pay your taxes, and we will give you this plum of citizenship, I think we are going to have millions and millions of people who don't pay any income tax at all.

In fact, we have that today. So this function of just pay your taxes 3 out of the last 5 years, it will be okay. That is not amnesty. I am saying that, itself, is amnesty to not require them to pay those taxes.

Another argument that is in the Senate bill is, well, they have been here working, they have been paying Social Security taxes, so surely you will want to grant them credit for the money that they earned so that they can collect their Social Security and put pressure on that system when they reach that retirement level.

Mr. Speaker, they earned the money illegally. If they weren't here working here legally, their earnings are not legal either. And to reward them with a retirement fund when our Social Security is going to go bankrupt if we don't overhaul that Social Security, and on that case, the President has been right all along, the need of a personal retirement accounts, need to overhaul Social Security, put more pressure on it because the Senate somehow believes it is not fair.

It isn't just if we don't grant people that have been working here against the law the benefits that come with that in the form of retirement and SSI. Their families are going to benefit from this as well, the death benefit that goes along with it, the disability benefit that comes along with it, because they have been earning money under a false Social Security number. And somehow we are going to ratify and certify and give people a benefit for having broken the laws of the United States of America. That is wrong, Mr. Speaker.

And so, Social Security is one piece of this. And putting citizenship up for sale is another piece. And how do you determine the value of that citizenship? Do you grant that by what is a coyote charging today? Is it \$1,500, \$2,000, \$3,200 in order to get passage into the United States illegally? Whatever that price is, it seems to be indexed pretty closely to the price that citizenship is for sale over in the United States Senate. That is how I would describe what is going on here: citizenship for sale in the United States Senate, running contrary to the rule of law, undermining American values, weakening our entire culture and building, not shutting off the jobs magnet, but turning on the current to the jobs magnet with even more amperage, Mr. Speaker.

Because once this carrot of citizenship, this path towards amnesty that would be granted under the Senate language happens, there will be untold millions more come across the border that want to come here and take advantage of the amnesty that has been offered, or if they aren't able to get on that particular bandwagon, then they will want to take advantage of the next inevitable amnesty that will come along.

There have been seven amnesties in the last 20 years. We talk about the 1986 amnesty; there have been six others. Smaller, lesser, they came about because we missed some people in 1986, so we had to pass a few more amnesties to catch up and kind of clean up those people that are here in this country. And the promise in 1986 was, well, but this is the last time. This time we really mean it, in 1986; this time we are really going to enforce the law. This time we are going to make sure that we seal and control our border. This time we are going to be 100 percent confident that the Federal Government is going to do their job. 1986.

And, you know, there was some enforcement going on in 1986. And it didn't take very long before we had a new President and then another new President, and then in 1992 we got President Clinton. And I was appalled at the lax approach that President Clinton had in enforcing our immigration laws. That is when I started to pay attention because I saw that there were people that were being naturalized before the 1996 election, particularly in California, perhaps a million of

them, who were hustled through the process and went to the polls and voted. And they knew their duty. Go to the polls and vote. Vote for the President. That is the way you say thank you for getting hustled through the citizenship process. That was appalling to me. A million people, many of them in California.

Those people, some of them have, for want of a better term, matriculated to Iowa in order to, and gone to work there, and that is how I hear these things, they come up there, a million people.

Today, a million people sounds like chump change, Mr. Speaker. A million people coming into the United States quickly under the Clinton administration. But, the facts are, employers during the Clinton administration were far more likely to be sanctioned and punished for hiring illegals than they are today. Under the Clinton administration, they were 19 times more likely to be sanctioned by the administration for hiring illegals than they are today. The risk was 19 times greater. That is how much enforcement has diminished over the last 20 years.

1986 to 2006 enforcement of immigration laws has gone down to the point where it is almost nonexistent. Border control has not been anything that alarmed anyone in this administration until they got an alarm that they weren't going to be able to get their guest worker plan passed, and then that alarm sent out the message that said, we are going to have to position ourselves so that America sees that we are going to enforce the laws. So we have got a few more Border Patrol agents. We have got a commitment to send the National Guard down there. We have got speeches that talk about a virtual fence. And I would say that a virtual fence is not going to keep out the forces that are pushing on that border.

Now, I could talk about this border to significant lengths. I have been there about four times in the last year. But I think that those trips down to the border are far less than those that have been made by my friend from Colorado. And my friend from Colorado has been on this issue, I believe, his entire congressional life.

I have been on it my entire public life and before. I grew up believing in the rule of law. It wasn't something that we conceived of sanctuary policies, or we didn't think that because we were a municipality or a county or a State that we didn't cooperate in enforcing Federal law. Law is law and we have to work together at all levels to enforce all laws.

And issue after issue has been brought to this floor and before the American people by my colleague from Colorado, and I would be very happy and honored to yield so much time as he may consume to the gentleman from Colorado, Mr. TOM TANCREDO.

Mr. TANCREDO. I thank the gentleman, and I appreciate his efforts on

behalf of the American people. I appreciate especially his efforts on behalf of those of us, well, in fact, the American people who are demanding that something be done here in the Congress of the United States to deal with the fact that people are coming into this country by the hundreds of thousands, in fact, by the millions. And they are coming in without our permission, and they are coming in without our knowledge, and they are essentially destroying the concept of the rule of law which is, of course, one of the building blocks of this great Nation.

And it is right that they should look to the Congress of the United States for some sort of action. And it is only because so much pressure has been placed on this body and on the Senate that we are seeing the kinds of bills coming forward that are ostensibly designed to deal with it.

I believe that the House bill we passed last December was a good step in the direction of dealing with illegal immigration. It was an enforcement-only bill. It did not provide amnesty to anyone who is presently here illegally. And that is the definition.

By the way, if you say to someone, let's get this straight, because this has really been the bane of our contest between the House and the Senate, in terms of what do we mean by "amnesty"?

□ 1745

The President has said and many Members of the Senate have said that their bill and that their idea is not amnesty because it does not provide automatic citizenship to people who are here illegally. And you have to ask yourself, as we ask them all the time, What law dictionary did you ever read that had that definition of "amnesty"?

Amnesty is, of course, when you do not provide the penalty that is prescribed by the law that has been violated. That is amnesty. So if you have come into this country illegally, there is a law that you have violated. What is the penalty? It is, under the law today, that you be deported.

Now, when you say to people that we are going to disregard that; that you can, in fact, be here illegally; that we will ignore that entirely, that now you may have to pay a fine or may have to do a couple of other little things; and, therefore, what I am saying is not amnesty, that is wrong, and it should not be allowed to go without being called because, frankly, they are trying to confuse the American people. And they want to go out and tout some sort of bill that will be, "enforcement only," but it will have this component: It will have a guest worker/amnesty component. Every single one of the bills over there has that. Some of the bills that have been introduced over here have that particular component.

So it is our duty, and my colleague has done a great job on this, to identify the problems and pointing out when people over on our side, even, try to in-

troduce legislation and, again, cloud the issue of amnesty, that we have got to be clear with the American people. This is far too important, and we cannot allow ourselves the great latitude that is designed in most of these bills to go out there and say we have dealt with immigration, because we have not.

You can see the fact that it is reaching a boiling point in America, and one way of determining that is to see what is happening in the States. And it is amazing because States now are taking on this issue because the Congress will not. States like Georgia and Alabama and Florida, and now we can add to the list Colorado, which recently passed a bill that came out of a special session called by the Governor. Now, this is amazing in and of itself, a special session of a State legislature. They had gone out of session.

The Governor called them back and said, You have got to deal with something here. And what was that something? Was it the prison system? No. It was illegal immigration, because, of course, the State of Colorado, like every State, is being impacted by this problem and impacted negatively. The costs are enormous. And so they were called into special session, and Colorado did pass a bill. By the way, a Democrat legislature that could not figure out a way to not pass it. I mean, they tried everything imaginable to avoid it, and finally they had to come to the point where they did pass legislation that will restrict social service benefits to people who are presently legally in the State of Colorado. And this is an amazing thing.

Like I say, Georgia has passed, I think, perhaps the best series of laws on this issue. The State of Alabama has contracted with the Federal Government in a memorandum of understanding saying that the State police will identify to ICE, the Immigration and Customs Enforcement, officials everyone they come in contact with who is an illegal immigrant and those people will in turn be taken away by ICE. That is an agreement they have come up with. Florida is following in their footsteps.

This is happening throughout the United States, and I am happy to see it. But it only points out that there has been a dereliction of duty here at the Federal level because clearly this is one of the constitutional areas that is clearly defined as Federal. I mean, it is our role. It is our responsibility. It falls on our shoulders.

Sixteen sheriffs along the border in Texas formed together an alliance to try to defend their border. I mean, what does that tell us here? They look to us for support. And one of the things they were asking for, by the way, was just financial aid so they could buy equipment and arms to be as well armed as the people they were facing on the other side of the border.

It is about time that we do something, but that something has to be

substantive. It cannot be eyewash. And it is going to be our duty, yours and mine and others who care about this issue, to bring to the attention of the American public exactly what is going on here, the nature of the bills that are being introduced. We have to be very specific, and we cannot let people cloud the issue.

So I just again want to thank my colleague from Iowa for the yeoman's work he has been doing on this and the fact that he has done exactly what I have said. He has identified bills that have been introduced, even by our own colleagues over here, specifically Mr. PENCE, and explained why those bills are, in fact, also amnesty. I mean, that bill is, in fact, amnesty, and others like it have an amnesty provision to it that people can get citizenship if they are here illegally under those bills. Even though there are all these protestations to the contrary, the fact is that that is still what is being pushed. The other side will do anything to get a guest worker/amnesty plan, including the suggestion that it will all be done under a guise of enforcement first. We have to be very careful.

And I just, again, want to thank my colleague for his efforts on behalf of the people of this country on especially this issue.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Colorado.

It is important, I think, Mr. Speaker, that we are able to hear that direct message from the Colorado State legislature. That is an amazing thing beyond the conception of us, I think, here a year or two or three ago, let alone four or five or six when this issue first came up. And I would even go back to my recollection in 1996, when Pat Buchanan ran for the Presidency and he said, I will call hearings. I will make sure we have a national debate on immigration.

And that was what we lacked in 1996. That is what Mr. TANCREDO has been working for for all of these years he has been in this Congress. We are at this point now where you cannot avoid a national debate on immigration. It is everywhere. It is in the coffee shop. It is at work. It is here in this Congress, Mr. Speaker. It is in our churches. It is in our homes. It is absolutely everywhere. And the reason is because it has gotten so bad that Americans are being personally impacted piece by piece by piece. They are standing up saying, What can I do within the jurisdiction that I have, within the resources that I have? How can I step in and fix this? And we have seen other States take action too. There have been 8 or 10 States that have had some kind of legislative immigration activity going on. And so I applaud them for that.

And the Minutemen, I had the privilege to go down to the border of Arizona and Mexico and help build some fence to get some of that project started. And I happen to have a list of 25 Members of Congress that would be happy to help put some fence up to be able to control this border.

But I want to lay a little groundwork for that before I yield to my colleagues. And that is this: that an administration that had the determination to shut off the jobs magnet and enforce the laws at our borders; if we had the ability and the will to enforce our borders and shut off that jobs magnet, and add into that shutting off birthright citizenship, which is another magnet that brings people here and starts that chain migration for up to 350,000 babies every year that should not have been born in the United States of America, those kinds of decisions from an administration that was committed could have kept this under manageable proportions.

But what really has happened is that lack of commitment has allowed for a lack of enforcement. The lack of enforcement, that message echoes through the entire countries south of our border, on the Rio Grande and at our border with Mexico. When that happens, it magnetizes and more people come into the United States.

Now we have a situation where 4 million people a year pour across our southern border. Four million. And I went down there and repeated what the Border Patrol tells me here in hearings, that they stop perhaps 25 to 33 percent, a fourth to a third of the illegal border crossers. And they are not very free about talking about what percentage of drugs they interdict coming down there. They will talk about the tonnage, but not the percentage. They say 25 to 33 percent of the border crossers they stop.

And I say that to the Border Patrol people who are down there sitting in a nice quiet place where they do not have to worry about a superior listening in on them. And some of them laughed when I said, You are stopping 25 percent, maybe 33 percent? Some of them laughed. None of them said yes. One of them went into hysterics and said, 25 percent? We are not stopping anywhere near 25 percent.

I asked them all what is the number. The most common number I got was perhaps 10 percent. I had one of the high-level investigators tell me we stop about 3 percent of the illegal crossers and about 5 percent of the illegal drugs. But the power and the force of this is just awesome. It is \$65 billion worth of illegal drugs coming across our southern border, and that is a powerful force, Mr. Speaker. That force is so powerful that even if we shut off all illegal people coming across the border, even if we shut off the jobs magnet here in the United States, even if we end birthright citizenship to shut off that magnet, that does nothing to shut off the \$65 billion worth of illegal drugs.

And that is why we have got to build a fence, and that is why we have got to build a wall. That is not an administrative decision on whether to enforce or not, whether to deploy people or not, or whether to actually arrest them and prosecute them. That is a physical bar-

rier, not an administrative decision. That is why it is important, Mr. Speaker.

And I would be happy to yield to my friend from Virginia who raised this issue with a powerful voice on immigration.

Mr. GOODE. Thank you, Mr. KING. I want to thank you for having this hour to address this most important topic. I also want to thank Congressman TANCREDI for his tireless efforts over about an 8-year period.

I was thinking the other day when the Immigration Reform Caucus first started that there was a handful of Members, and I believe it was around 1998 or 1999 when it first began. And now I think there are over 100 Members in that caucus. Well over a third of the House is in the Immigration Reform Caucus. And the issue received very little attention prior to September 11. After that the issue received greater attention.

I will have to say that I remember the days in the late 1990s when Mr. TANCREDI would come over here, and others who would talk on this issue, and it was almost as if he had leprosy. They did not want to talk about the issue. But the issue is probably the burning issue in the country today. If not, it is certainly in the top three.

And I want to thank Mr. KING, Mr. TANCREDI, Mr. MILLER, Mr. GINGREY, Mr. WILSON, and a number of other persons that are here tonight focusing on this issue which is so crucial to the future of the United States of America.

If the massive invasion is not stopped, we are going to be flooded to the extent that we will drift into third world status. For our children and for our grandchildren, we cannot fail on this issue.

You mentioned magnets, and that is the reason so many come.

Let us talk for a minute about amnesty. In my district there are some persons, I am pretty sure, here illegally, in the United States, and it is common sense, street talk about why they come. They say if we can get across the border, swim the Rio Grande, or walk across the mountains, avoid the dangers and the pitfalls of the gyrating temperatures, if we can get to this country and we just stay here a few years, history tells us we will get an amnesty and we will be okay. We can avoid the checks that all the others go through. We can avoid the background checks. We can avoid the health checks. We can avoid the security reviews that going through a regular visa process or becoming an H-1B or an H-2B or an H-2A worker involves.

□ 1800

Amnesty is the magnet. Other magnets that you mentioned are anchor babies who get benefits in this country and employer deductions for employees, even if they are here illegally, which Mr. KING is addressing. There are a number of other magnets,

but probably the biggest magnet is the notion, if I can get there just for a little while and stay a couple of years, I will be safe; I will never have to go back.

There will be some in that body across the hall or in the executive branch down at Pennsylvania Avenue saying there is nothing we can do; they are here now, we cannot be firm. But I would submit to you, as some of you on this issue have stated in the past, if we were to draw a line in the sand and say the Senate bill that includes amnesty would never become law, we will never have it in this country, we are putting a line in the sand tonight in saying no amnesty under any conditions, those that marched in by the tens of thousands would likely march out by the tens of thousands because they would know then that their hope for an amnesty like that which occurred in 1986 and like that which occurred under President Clinton would not happen again.

Failure to address this issue with firmness and forcefulness is creating a dangerous situation in this country. We have all talked about how those who would do us harm can infiltrate and become part of the flood that rolls into America day after day, hour after hour, and week after week. We must secure our borders.

We only have to look at the prison population in the United States. I serve on the Commerce, Justice, State Subcommittee of Appropriations. The head of the Department of the Federal Bureau of Prisons testified before our subcommittee just a couple of months ago, there are 189,000 persons incarcerated in the Federal penal system. Of that 189,000, 50,000 of them, according to him, are illegal aliens. Think how much we could reduce the Federal prison costs if we had no illegal aliens in this country. Think how much you could reduce local jail costs and State prison costs. That percentage of incarcerated illegal aliens far exceeds the percentage of illegal aliens in our current population.

I would like to close by mentioning deficit reduction. I hear many persons across the 5th District of Virginia, around the Commonwealth and in other parts of our country say, we need to get the deficit under control, we need to be in a position in this country of not having a deficit. When you add up the impact of illegal immigration on our local governments, our State governments and our own Federal Government, you are talking around \$70 billion per year, and that is probably a low estimate.

Stop illegal immigration by saying "no" to amnesty ever, and by adopting a number of the measures that the fighters for border security support, and we will go a long way towards ending the deficit in this country.

Mr. Speaker, thank you for this opportunity to address you.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Virginia

(Mr. GOODE) and appreciate particularly the strong voice that you have been, solid and consistent and strong. I remember you were at one point saying, I want a wall and I want it 2,000 miles long and I want it from San Diego to Brownsville. I am looking forward to the day when that last mile gets built, and by then maybe we will have the kind of border security that we need.

But Californians have a long experience with the border control issue, and one of the leaders on this issue is the gentleman from California (Mr. GARY MILLER), and I am very happy to yield to him.

Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, thank you very much for yielding.

I represent the 42nd Congressional District in California, and for those of you who have not been to California, I do not truly believe you understand the concept of illegal immigration.

When I hear my colleagues, and individuals I consider friends, they get up before us and say, a guest worker program is needed to fill those jobs that Americans will not do, I guess you have to define what are the jobs we are offering Americans. What wages are they offering Americans to work is probably the best question.

The National Journal, in fact, did a study that I know determined in 1973 that the average manufacturing job in nonmanagerial service work paid about \$15.24 an hour. At that time, you could get a job in construction, in manufacturing, most businesses. A man or woman could afford to own a home, send their kids to school, live a good, quality life and plan for the future. The problem was that in 2004, those jobs that in 1973 paid \$15.24 an hour, paid \$15.26 an hour.

Talk to the individual who was a carpenter, who was a plumber, who poured concrete, who did masonry, who was honorably employed by a manufacturing company, that was paid good wages, and you saw this dramatic change start to occur during the recession in California of the 1990s. All of the sudden things were tighter. People started hiring individuals here in this country for a much lesser wage than the American citizen was willing to do that job for.

A good example, I remember seeing dry-wallers being laid off and an illegal being hired. It is not that illegals are bad people. By and large, they are really good people. They are just trying to come here to better their lives. So it is not a matter of race or discrimination. It is just the fact that can the United States accept all the poor that this world wants to send here? And if we decided to do that, why not accept them from India? Why not accept them from Asia? Why not accept them from anyplace in the world and double, triple, quadruple our population if we are just going to be benevolent and accept people who are poor and want to better their lives?

But the problem you have, and this is back to the dry-waller, then you see an illegal hanging dry wall and his wife and kids are going behind him nailing the dry wall off to get the job done quicker so the husband could produce more at a much lesser rate than the American citizen was paid before.

Now, how do you explain that to the American who was born here, who was educated here, who perhaps does not want to put a suit and tie on to go to work in the morning, who wants to work with his hands in that job that he is very capable of doing, but cannot afford to do for the reduced rate that an illegal is willing to work for? How do you tell that man he cannot support his family, educate his children and cannot afford a home anymore?

In the National Journal, it is not me saying it, it is them saying it, that over 30 years later we are paying 2 cents per hour on average more than we were paying in 1993. I do not think Members of Congress who, as I say, get up and put a suit on in the morning and wear ties understand that people working for a living in this country are those who are most impacted by what we have done.

We have to hold employers accountable. For an employer to say, well, I just do not know; well, that is unrealistic, because we have a pilot program today that any employer in this country can go verify whether that individual is a citizen or not. If you are unwilling to do that and you hire questionable employees that you know or you suspect are not here legally, you are violating the laws of this country. The sad thing is, the violation of that law is hurting American workers who would love to have that job.

Are there some jobs in this country that I think we maybe need to look at? I think after we enforce the current laws that are on the books, or we pass new laws to stop illegal immigration, then let us look at the jobs that we do need to fill. I do not think there is an argument by many people that the agricultural industry, farmers, are probably going to need some labor. We have needed them historically since World War II, and before we had a program that took care of that.

So there are certain industries, whether it be landscaping, gardening, I do not know if we have got to have them for food services, but I think there are certain industries where we are probably going to recognize that we do need some guest worker programs.

But to come in with a concept, let us just have a guest worker program for anybody who wants to hire somebody at a wage an American citizen is not willing to work at is an absolutely unreasonable approach to a very real problem that is not getting better daily.

We talk about an amnesty program, which is what I consider the Senate bill to be. In 1986, we allowed amnesty, and what did it get us? Nothing. It created more citizens of those who were here il-

legal, but we did nothing to enforce the law after we allowed amnesty for those that were here illegally.

The American citizens, the people I represent, do not believe us anymore, and they do not believe us for good reason. What we told them that we were going to do in 1986 we did not do.

I think we need to go pass a law today, a new law that is strict, enforceable and specific on what we are going to allow and not allow. We need to prove to the American people that we are going to send law-breakers back and we are going to hold employers accountable for hiring people that are here illegally.

Now, one argument that I hear repeatedly is, well, what are you going to do with all the people that came here illegally? They came here for a job, and if there is no job, they will go back home. The government does not need to provide buses. The government needs to remove the incentives that allow people to live here.

There are many. We need to crack down on employers, number one. We need to prohibit access to credit and financial service. We need to prevent illegals from gaining access to food stamps, low-income housing and health care.

I cannot go to Mexico and buy a house. They will not allow me to. Well, why should somebody come to this country illegally, violating the laws of this country, and be eligible to do something that they will not allow us to do in their own country?

Can you imagine going to Mexico and saying, I want a ballot printed in English? I want you to teach my children English in school? I want you to provide free health care at the emergency ward at the hospital for them? And I want you to allow me to stay here when you know I am staying in violation of your laws?

If I go to Mexico illegally, they will arrest me, confiscate my assets and deport me immediately. Those who come here from those countries act like we are being abusive when they came from a country where they have not in any way tolerated what we are told we have to tolerate here.

Now, it does not amaze me that when we send a bill out of the House to stop this problem, that Mexico and South American countries would oppose it. Well, why would they not oppose it? It does not benefit their interests. Their interests are sending anybody to this country, helping them come to this country, provide information to them to come to this country so they can earn money and send it back to their home country. Well, that is wrong.

This is the Congress of the United States of America, and this Congress should protect American citizens first, understanding that in South America and Mexico there are very good people. They are our neighbors; there is no argument about that. But if they want to come here, they should come here the same way I have gone to their country;

and that is go there with a visa, go there with a passport, and when I am through, I come home. I cannot just overstay my welcome as long as I deem that I should be there. I have to come home or they will send me home.

We welcome them into our country if they want to come on vacation, come to visit their families or come to do what they want to do, but at the given time, you go home and you do not come here illegally to get a job thinking you are going to stay in violation of the laws this country has placed upon the books.

Now, we are either a country of laws or we are not a country of laws, and today, we do not enforce the laws of this country at all. This concept we have in the Senate bill of earned citizenship will absolutely bankrupt our social fabric in this country. We cannot spend \$50 billion a year, as it is estimated, on those coming to this country who, once they become citizens, are eligible for every program on the social books that we have in this country. We cannot afford it. We should not tolerate it.

Go to California and look at the impact on schools. I have talked to teachers who said they are holding this class back because the bulk of the student body in that class do not speak English. Now, yes, it is a benefit to those kids who are here illegally because they are being educated, but it is a tremendous detriment to the children of American citizens who are being held back because the rest of the class cannot speak English to be moved forward.

□ 1815

Go to an emergency ward in California. You will wait for hours. People go there that are illegal, cannot speak English, for a sprained ankle, for a headache, for a cold, for basic health care. That is not what an emergency ward is for. And who is paying the bill? The people who use the hospital, who are having to subsidize it because they are losing money treating illegals.

We are a compassionate country. There is no doubt about it. If someone is here and they have had an emergency and they need to go to the hospital, they should be treated. You should allow nobody to suffer, nobody to die, but you cannot tolerate 12 to 20 million people coming here with this concept that health care is free, because when they get it they do not have to pay it.

Well, you cannot blame them for that. The people you can blame are the people in this room, for not making sure the laws passed by this Congress are enforced in this country. We can no longer tolerate it. Once again, they are good people that are trying to get here, by and large not bad people. But the American citizen cannot afford it.

It is our responsibility, first of all, to protect and defend our borders. We are not doing it. And we should be concerned about the future of America and

American citizens. Hopefully, when this debate continues and enough good people come here and talk about the impact on this country, we will fix the wrong that has occurred and make sure it does not happen again.

Thank you.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California (Mr. GARY G. MILLER) for that presentation and that perspective. It is a little bit different one than I often bring to this debate, and very glad that it is here on the floor, Mr. Speaker, and am glad that it is something that the American people can pick up on as well.

Before I yield to the gentleman from Georgia, I am going to do the 2-minute drill on the King Wall on the border. I come to this conclusion this way. As the gentleman, Mr. MILLER, made the statement that people come here and work and send their money back. And that dollar figure now is \$20 billion that gets sent out of the labor here in the United States. Many of it is the labor of the people that are working here illegally. \$20 billion to Mexico. Another \$20 billion to Central America and the Caribbean. \$40 billion out of this economy being sent out by people who come here that undercut the wages of American people.

\$40 billion going south. \$65 billion going south to pay for the \$65 billion dollars worth of illegal drugs that come across our porous border. And they used to take that, and maybe still do, bring in some of those drugs on semis. There are places that the border is not even marked. So they can drive across the desert; they can drive their own road. In New Mexico, for example, the border, you would never know you crossed the border there, because when they finally set that border up, they set one of those big old big brass transits, probably not a lot different than Lewis and Clark had back in those days, and looked across at the horizon and put a concrete pylon up on top of the highest point of the horizon, lined up on that and then said, okay, now we will go to the next horizon, put up another one. That is all that is there.

And so there are roads that are made that cross the border a lot of places; the channel of the Rio Grande River gets driven across a lot of places. A place that is infamous, now called Neeley's Crossing, where they bring drugs across there and defend that border and threaten Americans that want to seal that off.

All this is going on, Mr. Speaker, and a lot of it is not just the force of people that want to come here for a little better life, not people who just want to pick lettuce or tomatoes or go work in a sheet rock crew or whatever it is, but \$65 billion worth of illegal drugs.

So whatever we might do to shut off the jobs magnet is not going to shut off those illegal drugs. That is another force. And that force is far more powerful than the desire for people to change their lifestyle.

So when I go down there and sit on that border, what I do is I have come to this conclusion: we cannot shut that off unless we build a fence and a wall. I want to put the fence in, but I want to put a wall in. I designed one. And this just simply is the desert floor. Put a trench in that desert floor.

We have the ability to put together a machine that would be a slip-form machine that would lay a footing, about like this, Mr. Speaker, if I give you a look at the end of that, so you would have that about 5 foot deep underneath the ground. That would keep the wall from tipping over.

We would pour a notch in it that allows us to put precast panels in. It would look like this, only this would be flush with the desert floor. And then you would bring in precast concrete panels, 10 feet wide, 13½ feet tall. They would construct it to be a 12-foot finished wall, just like that, Mr. Speaker.

Drop these panels in together, in this fashion, just take a crane and drop them in, Arnold Construction Company could build a mile a day of this pretty easily once you got your system going. And it is not all going to work, the whole 2,000 miles are not going to work that way, but a lot of it will work this way, Mr. Speaker.

And so just to wrap up this construction, this would be an example then of how that wall would look. Now you can also, you deconstruct it the same way. You can take it back down. If somehow they got their economy working, and got their laws working in Mexico, we can pull this back out just as easy as we can put it in. We can open it up again and we can open it up and let livestock run through there or whatever we choose.

I also say we need to do a few other things on top of that wall, and one of them being to put a little bit of wire on top here to provide a disincentive for people to climb over the top or put a ladder there.

We could also electrify this wire with the kind of current that would not kill somebody, but it would be a discouragement for them to be fooling around with it. We do that with livestock all the time. So I submit we build a wall like this, we do it for as many miles as we can, as many miles as we need, but it is roughly going to be 2,000.

And when you do that, then the Border Patrol that we are spending \$8 billion to protect 2,000 miles of border, \$4 million a mile, we can build this wall for about \$1.3 million a mile. If we do that, then that frees up our forces to be effective. And this would force the traffic through the ports of entry rather than across that vast open space that we have between San Diego and Brownsville.

This will be economically feasible. The \$4 million a mile, we can make an investment of about \$1.3 million for each mile, and that is only one time one year. Otherwise, we are paying Border Patrol \$4 million a mile every single year. What do we get out of it?

\$65 billion worth of illegal drugs and 4 million people coming across the border. This will shut off almost all of that. This will direct almost all of it through our ports of entry.

Those are the reasons, some of them, not all of them, Mr. Speaker, on why we need to build a wall. But in the brief time that we have, I want to make sure that I can yield to the gentleman from Georgia who has been such an eloquent voice on this issue.

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. KING very much for controlling the time in this hour. I thank him for yielding, and certainly Mr. MILLER and Mr. TANCREDO, Mr. GOODE and others that have spoken during this hour. Those are the eloquent voices on this issue. They are not crazy voices. They are voices that are basically saying, you know, we got laws in this country and we need to enforce them.

We need to secure our borders first and foremost before we consider any other options in regard to things like a temporary worker program or what to do with the estimated 12 million people here that have been in this country for various and sundry periods of time illegally, most of them working, yes. There is no way in the world you can determine really how long they are here because of fraudulent documents.

But the ideas that have been proffered, like the idea that my friend from Iowa has suggested in regard to this, because I do not know if we need a fence, Mr. Speaker, for 2,000 miles all of the way from Brownsville to San Diego, but we definitely need some fencing. There is no question about it. There are certain areas of our southern border that you cannot control without the type of fencing that Mr. KING has described.

And we need to do that. In fact, in this body, in this House of Representatives, in our bill that we passed, actually we passed two bills over the last couple of years, the first one being the REAL ID Act, which is exactly what the 9/11 Commission has asked for, that bipartisan commission in unanimous fashion, we responded to exactly what they were asking us to do in the REAL ID Act.

Then we followed up with the Border Security Act toward the end of 2005, calling, Mr. Speaker, for 750 miles of fencing, not 2,000, but 750. What does the Senate do? They come along with a bill that calls for about maybe 300 miles of fencing, at the very most 370 miles.

My friend, Mr. KING, who has been such a strong advocate on this issue of border security knows that that is totally, totally inadequate, particularly if you are talking about the dense population centers below our border States. I know in the REAL ID Act, we finally completed 14 miles of fencing at the San Diego border that the environmentalists had blocked for years because of some endangered shrub the hordes of illegals that were crossing trample those shrubs down pretty ef-

fectively, taking care of any concerns that the environmentalists may have had.

But listen to some of the things that are in the bill on the Senate side compared to what we have passed on the House side. They would allow guest workers, so-called guest workers to be paid the prevailing wage. That is the Obama amendment, when American citizens do not have to be paid prevailing wage.

They expand the visa waiver program to countries in the European Union in good standing with the United States and allow the State Department discretion for adding new member countries. Mr. Speaker, we need to suspend the visa waiver program. We absolutely, after 9/11, this idea of saying that people can come into this country with a passport, no visa, and stay for 90 days, no way of knowing exactly who they are, just a routine stamp of a passport, and then they may or may not go home after that vacation or that summer that they spend in one of our colleges or universities, and we do not know where they are.

We need, and we called for this in the PATRIOT Act, we called for this in the 9/11 Act, that we knew, we could verify entry and exit. Until we can do that, the idea of expanding, Mr. Speaker, the visa waiver program is ridiculous.

The bottom line is this. I think the House has got it right. I think the Senate has it wrong. We need to secure our borders first and foremost. And no amnesty. I yield back. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. KING of Iowa. I thank the gentleman from Georgia. I yield back, Mr. Speaker.

30-SOMETHING WORKING GROUP

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WILSON of South Carolina). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2005, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MEEK) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, once again it is an honor to come to the House floor. We would like to thank the Democratic leadership for allowing us to have this hour. The 30-something Working Group, as you know, comes to the floor if not daily every other day when we have the opportunity to do so, to share with the Members of the House initiatives and plans that we have on the Democratic side of the aisle that will make America better and stronger.

As you know, we have been on the message of a new direction for America, and we have been working very hard on that because that is the message that we have and that the American people are looking forward to seeing implemented.

So many times here on this floor, we talk about ideas and concepts, but they never really make it to the legislative debate, due to the fact that here in the House, Democrats are in the minority;

and the majority has adopted a rule that there is not a true bipartisan spirit here in this House, only when we vote on post offices and naming bridges.

But when it comes down to policy, policy that is affecting the people that we represent every day, there is a great divide, a divide to where we are not sitting down at the negotiating table, in committee, in subcommittee, and definitely not sitting down before legislation comes to the floor in a conference committee to talk about what is best for America and how can we make it better.

The American people yearn and hope for Democrats and Republicans and the one Independent in this House to work together. I think it is important to outline the fact that our leadership has said if given the opportunity, earning the opportunity of the American people to lead, that you will see a bipartisan spirit, not only spirit, you will see bipartisan action in this House on major pieces of legislation dealing with health care, education, how we are going to balance the budget, just not talk on how to cut the deficit in half or we may cut the deficit in half, really breaking down the deficit so that we will not pay more than what we are spending and investing in education, homeland security, and veteran affairs.

That is why we come to the floor. And we start talking about a new direction for America, making sure that health care through prescription drugs, and also making sure that HMOs eliminate wasteful spending and a number of other reforms that should take place there so that we do not have so many Americans going into emergency rooms.

Also lowering the price of gas and achieving energy independence is one of our major goals. There was just a report that was released by the Agriculture Department that is now having some sort of discussion about ethanol and what we can use, how we can use the ethanol and how it can play a role in making us independent, the E-85, and our proposal of putting America on a new direction or in a new direction.

□ 1830

We talk about the importance of alternative fuels, not just investing in the Middle East and not investing in the Midwest. So we look forward to continuing to push that philosophy here on this floor as we have the opportunity to lead this House, knowing the American people can deliver that, making sure that working families making more than what is presently the minimum wage, increasing that minimum wage, making sure they are able to bring home more to their families.

Millions of Americans are living on the minimum wage. It has been very difficult. And we have charts here, Mr. Speaker, that would illustrate how the minimum wage, we haven't seen a national minimum wage hike since 1997,

but we have seen increases in other areas where families are still expected to perform under those circumstances. And I think that is where we are finding our shortfall as it relates to individuals being able to afford college. Cutting the cost for college, making sure that there is a tax deduction for college tuition and expanding the Pell grants and cutting the student loan costs in half, making sure that college is affordable, and rolling back the increases that Republican Congress have put on students.

Not just students. When people talk about students, they think that we are just talking about young people that graduate from high school. We are talking about families that have invested their entire lives with their children to make sure that they can go to school, that it is affordable, that we don't continue to move the goal post the closer families get to making sure that they can provide for their young people to achieve a college education.

Also, preventing the privatization of Social Security, coming up with real Social Security reform, and making sure that folks can retire in dignity knowing that they have a Social Security plan and a Social Security card that is more, that stands for the security of their retirement.

Also, those individuals that are on disability, those individuals that are receiving survivor benefits, making sure that they don't end up in some line somewhere reporting to some private institution because someone thought it was a great idea to make money for individuals on Wall Street.

And, lastly, I would say a part of a new direction for America is really being fiscally responsible. Now, the first Democratic hour out here, Mr. Speaker, we had the Blue Dog Democrats that were here, and they spent the entire hour talking about fiscal responsibility. And I think it is important that the American people and the Republican majority House understand that we have the will and the desire and the track record to show that we truly know how to balance the budget, surpluses as far as the eye can see when President Bush went into office and a Republican majority was emboldened, and now we are borrowing at a rate that one writer in the Washington Times, Mr. Chapman, had said that the President has dethroned Lyndon Johnson as it relates to spending. And that is a heavy statement to make, even though I feel very strongly that President Johnson at that time of transition invested truly in America and not just in billionaires and millionaires receiving tax cuts, and also oil companies running away with public dollar giveaways to them and record profits at the same time.

I am so honored tonight, Mr. Speaker, as usual, to be joined by my colleague just north of my district and just west of my district and east of my district in some areas, Ms. DEBBIE WASSERMAN SCHULTZ from Florida, and

also Mr. TIM RYAN from Youngstown, Ohio.

As you know, last evening, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, I was sharing with the Members we don't just come to the floor, we actually meet to talk about these issues that are facing Americans. And I think it is important that we continue in that spirit and moving America in the right direction, in a new direction than what they see right now from the Republican majority.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. And it is a privilege to join you and Mr. RYAN and Mr. DELAHUNT each night that we take the House floor and talk about the new direction that we as Democrats would take this country. Because what most people have seen in America recently is essentially the Republican leadership's efforts to engage in the politics of distraction, because they have to distract the American people from what is really going on here because the reality that is going on here is too painful to closely examine.

I mean, they certainly can't hold up their wild success to the American people for examination and celebration because they haven't had any wild success. We are looking here at a record deficit, as you discussed, Mr. MEEK. We are looking at record gas prices. We are looking at record numbers of Americans who are without health insurance. We are looking at record increases in the cost of health insurance, small business owners who are unable to continue to support their employees and provide them with health insurance benefits. And we are looking at a woeful inability on the part of the Republican administration and this leadership of this House to protect the homeland and focus on domestic homeland security.

That is why they instead have focused on things like the Pledge of Allegiance and whether students are saying "under God" in school when they recite the Pledge of Allegiance, and they are focusing on amending the Constitution to prohibit flag burning or amending the Constitution to ban gay marriage. Now, each of us might have our own individual opinion on those matters, but when you go to Youngstown, Mr. RYAN, when you go to Miami, and when I go home to Broward County, I just don't hear, and I would bet you my last dollar that the vast majority of our Republican colleagues don't hear one, two, three, four, or five on the list any of those items. More likely, you have the father of four who leaves his house in the morning not worried about whether his son is going to be able to say "under God: In the Pledge of Allegiance that day, but whether or not he is going to be able to afford the \$55 it is going to cost him, at least, or around, to fill up his gas tank.

And how about the mom whose son or daughter is fighting on our Nation's behalf in Iraq or Afghanistan? Do you think she is worried about whether Congress is going to pass a constitu-

tional amendment to ban flag burning? Because that is certainly a notion of patriotism. Or is she more likely praying every single day that her baby is going to come home to her? I would say it is more likely the latter. And those are the kinds of issues that people are addressing with us when we go home.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Or at least have a discussion about how is this going to end; how is this thing we have in the Middle East going to end. We are not having that discussion. We are all patriotic; we all support the country. We are Members of Congress. For God's sake, we love America. That is easy. And if you want to say "under God," say it. Parents should tell their kids, just say it. Problem solved.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. But could you imagine, they actually rolled out an agenda that those items were at the top of the list. Because what they have to do is they have to try to distract the American people from their pitiful failure here, from their inability to get a handle on the deficit, from their inability to do anything about alternative energy exploration and reducing gas prices, about their inability to expand health care to more people, and their inability to develop any sort of plan to eventually get us out of this endless war in Iraq, and their inability to deal with domestic homeland security, border security, while protecting our American people here at home.

They are real focused on protecting everybody else in the world and making sure that everybody else in the world's quality of life is in good shape. What about the folks here? No, instead they just want to spend a lot of time on the issues that are really none of their business, that are really just decisions that families make inside their own homes among family members.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. I guess if we were on the other side, Mr. Speaker, I guess the question we have to ask ourselves is, Why are they trying to distract? What are they distracting us from? And I think when you look at what is happening and why the Democrats want to take the country into a new direction, all you have to do is look around. And I know, Mr. MEEK, and you know, Mr. MEEK and Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, there are a lot of Republicans, when we start saying this stuff, they have got to turn their TV off, they can't listen to it because I think it rings true.

The bottom line is this, the neoconservative Republican agenda has been implemented into the United States, period. And look around, here is what it looks like: Iraq, Afghanistan, gas prices, health care prices, tuition costs, minimum wage. Look around. Deficits, who are you borrowing it from? That is the neoconservative agenda. It is here. And we need to take the country in another direction. So they obviously don't want to talk about it.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. So as Mr. MEEK was saying, what we would

do if we were in the majority, and hopefully the American people will give us that opportunity in November, we would make sure right at the get-go as Leader PELOSI, who will be Speaker PELOSI when we win back the majority, as she talks about, one of the first things that we will do the first week, raise the minimum wage. It hasn't happened since 1997, going on 9 years now. That is just pitiful. You have got people in America, 7 million people in America making \$5.15 an hour. That is just an outrage. And we have got to make sure, that is the kind of issue that people need the Congress to deal with.

I mean, in our home State we have had to address it inside the State of Florida. Because the Federal minimum wage hasn't been raised in 9 years, we have got to make sure as we take the country in a new direction, as Democrats would do, we would focus on fixing the ridiculous prescription drug plan that they passed for Medicare beneficiaries. We would make sure that the doughnut hole that provides this humongous gap that senior citizens are falling through after they reach I think about \$2,500 in coverage for prescription drugs, they fall through that doughnut hole, and they literally have to spend several thousand dollars out of their own pocket before the part D prescription drug benefit picks back up.

It also prohibits the Federal Government from negotiating with pharmaceutical companies. We would make that change, and we would require the Federal Government to negotiate with pharmaceutical companies. Literally, the difference between prohibition and requiring it, and just like they do in the VA right now, and save millions and millions of dollars. I mean, who was this bill for?

If you want to make sure that there is a part D prescription drug benefit that benefits senior citizens, then people will vote for us. If they want to make sure that there is one that benefits the pharmaceutical industry, then people will vote for them.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. And just those few steps that we can take in the first week that we are here, talk about taking the country in a new direction. Imagine if we raised the minimum wage that first day, imagine we cut the student loan interest rates in half saving students and parents \$4,000 or \$5,000 over the life of the loan, the negotiation by the Secretary of Health and Human Services with the pharmaceutical companies, the money we would be able to save the government just in those three steps. We are not talking about brain surgery here. We are talking about basic fundamental commonsense moves that will benefit everyone, commonsense moves for the common good. And I think moving the country in a new direction is what we need to do.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. And when people ask what the Democratic

agenda is, that is it right there. That is what we would do.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. That is it. We don't have some elaborate playbook that is going to run left and fake this way and run this way. Three or four different basic things, and you will see the difference between having Democrats running the government and Republicans.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. And Republicans can't get away with saying all the things that we would do would cost money and build the deficit, because we would reinstate the pay-as-you-go rule, the PAYGO rules, to ensure that we don't spend more money than we take in, which is how when President Clinton was in office we had a surplus and not a deficit.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. I would like to yield to Mr. DELAHUNT.

Mr. DELAHUNT. I thank my friend and chairman of the 30-something Group for yielding. I apologize for being a bit tardy, but I had business back in the office.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Something more important than us.

Mr. DELAHUNT. No, that is not the case.

But I heard you talk about Medicare, and it provoked a special interest.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. A personal reaction?

Mr. DELAHUNT. A personal special interest, because I don't know if you are aware of this, I am somewhat embarrassed to acknowledge this in a venue such as this, but a week from today I will be on Medicare.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Wow. When is your birthday?

Mr. DELAHUNT. July 18 is my birthday, and I hit that magic figure that entitles me to be eligible for Medicare. And if there is a single program that has made a difference in the lives of senior citizens, I was going to say elderly, but I think I will change that now, of senior citizens in this country, it is the Medicare program. There has been study after study which concludes that there is a connection between longevity and the advent back in 1965 of Medicare and health that now the older segment of the population enjoys. It is absolutely an essential, critical program.

□ 1845

Part of that, as Congresswoman WASSERMAN SCHULTZ was saying, is the fact that today, rather than referring people to hospitals, the percentage of treatment that is given to senior citizens is through prescribed pharmaceuticals. It has made clearly a world of difference.

And when we had this debate back in December of 2004, about the so-called prescription drug benefit, Democrats argued that to prohibit the Federal Government from negotiating with the large drug manufacturers for discounts, substantial discounts, as you just indicated, as they do now with the VA, was nothing but a windfall profit

for large drug companies. I don't know what the estimate is now, but you said millions. Let me respectfully disagree with you and say tens of billions, maybe in excess of 100 billion, but it is clearly a substantial amount of money.

Just stop and think for 1 minute. That money would eliminate the doughnut hole. And by the doughnut hole, we mean once the cost of a particular prescription exceeds an amount, I think it is \$2,600, for the next \$3,000-plus a senior citizen has to pay for that prescription out of his or her own pocket.

We are already receiving calls, I do not know if your district offices have had this experience, but the volume of calls from seniors saying, you know, I didn't realize how quickly I would reach that so-called doughnut hole, and I can't afford the next \$3,000 to meet my medical needs. And I need those drugs that take care of my cardiac problem, for example, and I can't afford it, Mr. Congressman. What am I going to do?

I know you are saying that we can address that, and we can address that without adding to the deficit, but I think that is a commitment that ought to be made to people who are on Medicare so that they can enjoy a longer and more healthy life as they age, because they deserve it.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Well, Mr. DELAHUNT, I think it is important to take it away from the political debate here on this floor, between what we believe that the American people want and need versus what the special interests must have. The only way that people are going to win on this floor is if we give them voice.

Last night, we got into a passionate discussion about the minimum wage and why it was important. And we, I think, all agree that we give those individuals voice that are punching in and out every day and catching the early bus. We give voice to that mother that is trying to figure out how she is going to get the kids to school and make it to work making minimum wage, working more than half a day to even cover the gas costs, let alone having to buy groceries and do all those other things; and that father that catches the early bus and is trying to make it happen.

So I think that as these fuel prices continue to go up, as it relates to Medicare, there is this quiet inching up the storm of new requirements and new loopholes for seniors to jump through in the hopes they will not follow through or go through all those hoops, so that they do not get what they deserve.

Mr. DELAHUNT. I don't know if any of you saw it, I think it was yesterday in our major newspapers, I noticed that there was a story relative to a report that indicated that much of the information that seniors received relative to the prescription drug program was erroneous and inaccurate. And we all know about the confusion at the beginning of the program.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Remember the error that was made by the Department of Health and Human Services in the Medicare and You handbook they sent out to all the Medicare beneficiaries? And when they recognized the error in information about the prescription drug program and advising people who were dual-eligible what kind and how comprehensive their benefits were going to be and how much they were going to have to pay for them, they refused to send out a correction. The only way they were going to make the real answers available was via the Internet or if people called and asked.

Now, how is that a commitment to clarity, to making sure people can truly access the benefits that they are entitled to and that they do not pay more than they are supposed to?

Mr. DELAHUNT. And what is happening now, as I said, senior citizens were unaware of the fact that that limit would be reached so quickly, which would put them into the doughnut hole, or I call it the "abyss."

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. The belly of a whale.

Mr. DELAHUNT. Right. Because that has happened so quickly that they believed initially that it was only the moneys that they had to pay out under the so-called copayment system. But, no, it was the total amount of the cost of the drug between what they had to pay out of their pocket and what the government was paying.

So all of a sudden, people who are spending \$600, \$700, \$800 a month on a drug regimen for, let us use the example of those who have a cardiac problem, will find themselves, in 3 or 4 months, having already reached that cap and now they are on their own. And that is happening now.

Meanwhile, we cannot negotiate with drug manufacturers because the Republican majority was protecting the pharmaceutical industry.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Mr. DELAHUNT, the American people want to be leveled with, that is the bottom line. Mr. RYAN said it earlier. They just want us to shoot straight. They want someone to be truthful with them. In some parts of America they say, it is what it is; and if it is about the numbers of what the private sector and what the special interests can make off of every deal.

Yes, we all want a prescription drug plan, but at the same time we want to be able to make sure we get the biggest bang for the buck. And not for the special interests, but for the people that need the drugs and the meds. Yes, we want to help oil companies be able to be innovative and to find alternative fuels, but not on the backs of Americans paying \$3.25 a gallon. And, yes, we do want people to have the opportunity to have quality health care, but not being gouged as it relates to health insurance, watching out for the health insurance companies first.

The Republican majority has done that, and then confusing people to the

point where they are misled, and so some of them just throw their hands up and walk the other way.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, you talked about the changes and the problems and the mistakes within the literature that was given out. I was about to say, this is the big leagues. This is the big leagues. We are the Federal Government. The lights are on in this Chamber not because we are great people, but because the people of America pay taxes so that they will have a government that will stand up for them.

I have never seen a campaign sign saying I am running for Congress to protect the special interests, vote for me. No one said to me, Congressman, I want you to make sure ExxonMobil and companies like that get what they need to make sure their shareholders are making the kind of money they need to make. They sent me here to make sure they can get from point A to point B and so that we would watch out for their dollars when we got here.

I am telling you, I am very, very concerned, Mr. DELAHUNT, and beyond partisanship, of what is happening to the majority as it relates to the ongoing blocking on behalf of the special interests. You can see the tracking as it relates to fund-raising, the K Street Project, a number of other issues we know so much about: the scandals here in town as relates to special interests getting what they want; Members being pushed up to the back of the wall there in the corner, with leadership saying, you will vote for this or you will vote against that; and the voting board being held open for not only several minutes but hours in some cases to make sure the special interests get their way.

Mr. DELAHUNT, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, and Mr. RYAN, it would be wonderful to see the board held open so that the American people can get a minimum wage increase that they haven't gotten since 1997.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER stood right here and told the Speaker, it is a shame that we are leaving here on the 4th of July break and we haven't addressed the issue of millions of Americans still making \$5 and some change since 1997; meanwhile the cost of milk, bread, health insurance and everything else has gone up.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Really, what it boils down to is exactly what you are saying, it is that they are completely out of touch.

And I just want to pull up this illustration. We have our third-party validators here that really help us demonstrate what we are talking about on the floor each night, Mr. Speaker. It is not information we are making up. It is not the Debbie Wasserman Schultz encyclopedia or the Tim Ryan dictionary. These are facts we are laying out in front of the American people so that they can decide whether they want to continue down the path the Republican leadership has taken them on or whether they want to go in a new direction.

It is clear that the Republicans have made these decisions because they are out of touch. I mean, let us just look at the real economic changes under this administration, under President Bush and the Republican leadership, as opposed to the bogus one that they rolled out today with their economic midyear review.

You can make numbers, as they have done, look as rosy as you would like, but this is the real deal. Let us be clear, the Majority Leader, Mr. BOEHNER, specifically said on June 20: "I have been in this business for 25 years, and I have never voted for an increase in the minimum wage. I am opposed to it, and I think a vast majority of our conference is opposed to it." And he said that on June 20 of 2006.

So let us take a walk down memory lane here. If you actually are in touch with what everyday Americans are dealing with, then you will know that, of course, since 1997, there has been no minimum wage increase. But if you look at the price of milk, the price of milk has gone up 24 percent. And if you actually shop in the supermarket, like I do, then you will know that the price of milk has steadily increased when you are trying to buy a gallon of it.

How about the price of bread? That has gone up 25 percent. We are talking about staples that people actually pay for with their minimum wage increase, if they get one. Or don't get one.

Let us take a look at the cost of a 4-year public college education. The cost of that has gone up 77 percent since 1997.

Look at the cost of health insurance. That has gone up 97 percent. But no minimum wage increase in 9 years.

How about the price of regular gas? That has gone up, as every working family knows, 136 percent. And while I am at it, I might as well pull out my little toy prop here, because I think it is illustrative.

I think part of the problem is, it is clear by that chart that most Republicans obviously aren't dealing with these issues every day. They are not buying their own bread. They couldn't be; otherwise they would know that it has increased as much as it has. They are not buying their own gallons of milk. Maybe they have their household staff buy these things for them, or maybe they do it on the Internet. Or I am not sure what is going on.

But when it comes to the price of a gallon of gas, this is an old-fashioned gas tank, or gas pump. I have just concluded that it is obvious that the Republicans have not done anything about gas prices, Mr. RYAN, because most of them clearly have not used their own gas pump to fill their own gas tanks since they looked like this. Because otherwise they would be more committed to, instead of doing the bidding of the oil industry by passing legislation that puts money, more and more millions and billions in their pockets, they would make sure we invested, truly invested in expanding our

alternative energy resources, so that we could reduce the cost of a gallon of gas, and so that we could make sure that the Congress would focus on the issues that people in America really care about.

□ 1900

But it is clear to me that they haven't used one of these for a really long time, and that is the reason they are so out of touch.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. It is the same old song, we don't need a minimum wage increase. Things are going just fine. The President said the economy is doing great and it is benefiting all Americans. Well, he hasn't been to my district, and I am sure he has not been to a lot of districts around the country where people are struggling.

I found it interesting, over the 4th of July break where we do a lot of parades, and doing a parade is like taking a poll in your district as to how people feel. They will shout at you exactly what they are thinking. As you are going down and shaking hands and meeting people, you hear about the gas prices and the lack of vision; you hear about the trailers sitting in Hope, Arkansas. And you hear about the \$9 billion being lost in Iraq. This is what average Americans are talking about.

And then the kicker is when the Republican Congress pushes a pay raise for themselves, but not a pay raise for the American people. Give me a break. They raise the salary for Members of Congress, but at the same time not at least tie it to minimum wage and say the American people need to be a part of this, too? Come on. What is going on?

No matter what issue you are talking about, and this is the thread that ties all of this together, the Republican majority is incapable of executing government as stated by our friend, Newt Gingrich.

Mr. Speaker, he said, "They are seen by the country as being in charge of a government that can't function." He, the former Speaker of the House, the father of the Republican revolution, is now calling the leadership and the Republican Members of Congress "they" and also saying that they are in charge of a government that can't function.

Whether you are talking about negotiating down the drug prices or the \$9 billion in Iraq, or FEMA, or any other issue, I think time and time again they are seen as being incapable of being able to execute government.

Mr. DELAHUNT. They don't believe in government. That is the truth. Their version of government is simply the smaller the better.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Unless, of course, it involves their personal life.

Mr. DELAHUNT. Exactly. Unless it involves involving the United States in a quagmire.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Mr. DELAHUNT, I don't want you to get too far away from "they believe in smaller govern-

ment." They believe in big government. The government has grown larger than any other time in recent history. Out-of-control discretionary spending, pork barrel spending. An article I read last night, they said that the President has dethroned President Johnson as it relates to spending. What they say and what they do, that is the reason we are here on this floor. We are saying "they" because that is what Newt Gingrich called them, "they."

Mr. DELAHUNT. I was going to make that point and you did it for me.

But let me say what we now see is big government, big government promulgating and pursuing an agenda that is not a conservative agenda. I think we should make that distinction. It is a neoconservative direction because traditionally Republicans have been committed to responsible government, pay as you go, live within your means.

And government is important, but there are areas where government does not have a role. And yet here we are today with this President and this Republican majority presiding over the largest expansion of government in American history. And the expansion of government only benefits a small segment of the American population.

That is what I would suggest is causing the anxiety and the negative reaction that we hear when we march in those parades.

What about this Medicare drug program? It sounds good, but it is not helping me. Who is it helping?

And how do you respond to a question: Why can't you negotiate with the large drug companies and secure discounts like you do through the Veterans Administration? Why can't you secure discounts of 40, 50, 60, 70 percent? Why can't you do that? Why can't Congress insist?

And the answer is because the Republican leadership will not allow it. It simply won't allow it.

And, Congressman, we read about the oil companies, the energy companies, Big Oil, if you will. We understand that in 2002 their combined net profit was \$35 billion; that's a lot of money. Now we see new figures that it exceeds \$113 billion. It has tripled in about 3 years. Congressman, can you explain to me why you and your colleagues approve of giving taxpayer money to Big Oil in the amount of \$14 billion? Can somebody help me answer that question?

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Because they care more about the special interests than they do about the people they represent. It is as simple as that. It is the only logical explanation.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Last night, and Mr. Speaker, I hate to keep referring back to last night for the folks who did not see us here on this floor, the Members who did not see us here on this floor last night, we talked about the chart Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ broke out with minimum wage at zero, and we talked about the White House meeting in the complex, and I am not going to read The Washington Post article

again, but it happened in 2001, Mr. DELAHUNT. And these are the profits that oil companies earned, record profits. In 2002 it paid off immediately at \$34 billion in new profits to oil companies. And in 2003, it went to \$53 billion in new profits.

This is not something just coincidental. There was a strategy. They wrote the energy bill. They came up with the plan and they had access in the White House and here in this House of Representatives under the K Street Project and got what they wanted. In 2004, \$84 billion. In 2005, \$113 billion.

Now these oil companies, as far as I am concerned, they are just doing what they have access to do. I am more concerned with those of us with voting cards, Members of Congress, those of us who have an A pass over at the White House in the East Wing, that allow oil companies to go in, say what they want and get it on the backs of the American people.

Those profits don't just come out of the sky. They come out of the pocketbook and wallets of everyday Americans. While they are reaching into that credit card and while they are reaching in for that cash, they are passing their voter registration card. It can have REP on it, it can have DEM on it, it can have IND on it. Whatever the case may be, the bottom line is it is the same amount of money coming out of those wallets, not because of their doing, the American people's doing, but because of the special interest influence over the Republican majority. So that is what I am mainly concerned about here.

The last chart I want to share, oil companies, they are telling our friends they are trying to head towards energy independence. They will come to the Hill and say this is what we are doing with the money you've given us, the taxpayers' dollars.

I will tell you what they are doing. I happen to be one of these "Today Show" watchers, and the CEO of ExxonMobil was on there, a really nice guy with a deep voice and everything: "I thought I would come in." This was before Katie Couric left. "I thought I would come in and give our side of the story. We are for energy innovation. We are for getting oil and gas prices down."

This is what they are doing. This is E-85, what we call ethanol. This is supposed to be the alternative to help us with our energy independence. This is regular, special, and super plus. This is their deal. This is the old-school way of doing things. This is the expensive way of doing things. I am going to show you how this discourages you from getting ethanol.

You can use a Mobil credit card to buy the three levels there where we invest in the Middle East versus the Midwest. This is the Midwest investment using corn and other resources to make it happen. But it says here "Cannot use your Mobil credit card," period.

Now you can walk in the store and you can buy a bag of chips, you can

even probably buy a carton of cigarettes with your Mobil credit card, but you can't get E-85. The reason you can't get E-85 is because they don't want you to get E-85.

So when the President is running around here talking about Americans being addicted to oil, well, guess what, oil is addicted to the free-fall access that they have here in this House of Representatives and in the White House. They are getting their way. The American people are not getting their way, and it is point-blank.

And I would like to break this thing down to where everyone can understand. I don't need to tell you that I am on your side as a Member of Congress on this side of the aisle. I think those who are paying attention know whose side we are on. They know based on the record. It seems like they are more interested in helping the special interests. That is what the record reflects.

The record reflects that the special interests are getting exactly what they want. It is the best time in special interest days. It is not the best time in America; it is the best time for all of the big guys that wear nice ties and ride around in big cars, being driven around here in Washington, D.C. It is the heyday for them. It hasn't been better for special interests.

There are record-breaking profits for the oil companies. It hasn't been better in the history of drilling into the ground for oil. And guess what, it is on the backs of the American people. I mean, they are riding the backs of the American people, riding them down into the ground until their faces hit the ground and they scratch their forehead, on the backs of the American people, a la the Republican majority, the rubber-stamp Congress and the White House.

When you say that, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, we just have to break it down.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Let's break it down further, Mr. MEEK. If that was not enough evidence, let's take a look at a Congressional Research Service report, which is an objective body which provides information to the Congress, both parties, totally objective entity, provided a memo to Senator WYDEN last week, and that memo outlined the profits and revenue return for the oil companies from 1999 to now. And it demonstrated that the annual revenue return for eight oil companies increased from 2.88 percent in 1999 to 7.1 percent in 2005 while the return on shareholder equity went from 4.64 percent to almost 30 percent. Cash reserves for those same companies shot up from \$9.5 million in 1999 to \$57.8 million last year, and the capital investment that they made went from \$32.8 million to \$68.8 million in the same period.

The bottom line is that when they say they are investing their revenue that they are generating into alternative oil exploration, it is baloney. It

is absolutely not true. What they are doing is they are keeping their profits. They are holding onto their profits, and we are giving them the money by forgiving them royalty payments for the land that we are letting them drill for oil on.

So who is for the American people and who is just kidding?

Mr. MEEK of Florida. We had a debate right before the July 4 break.

□ 1915

When I was a State trooper in Florida, we used to have these little different details around the State of Florida. I was in Sebring, Florida, which is Highlands County, and I was talking to this farmer, and he said that "Pigs get fat and hogs get slaughtered."

And I am going to tell you right now, the oil companies and the access that they have to Members of Congress on the majority side to give them what they want, they are getting it all right now.

Let's look at the oil leases. They want to drill off the coast of Florida. Less than 1 percent, super less than 1 percent of 4,000 leases that they already hold, that they are actually going and drilling in those areas, but they wanted even more.

They wanted more, Mr. DELAHUNT. They wanted more because you know something? They can get it. It is like a kid sitting down at the table and they are eating ice cream and they have a tummy ache and they have ice cream all around their face, and they say, give me another gallon. And you give it to them.

And that is exactly what this Republican majority, this rubber-stamp Congress has done, everything they have asked for, because they have access through the K Street Project and other programs that allow them to see through the doors of this Chamber and have Members vote "yes" for what they want and "no" for what they don't want. And what they don't want is for the American people to be on a level keel to be able to push back on this feeding frenzy of not only their tax dollars and special interest giveaways, but to kill them at the pump.

I mean, I see people hesitate when they get out of their cars because they are, like, I don't know if I have room on my credit card. I don't know how much it is going to cost me today. The gas stations can't even change the charts out front fast enough because gas prices are going up.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Do you know what my husband and I noticed the other day when we were filling up our tank? That the dimes, you know how when we were little kids and the pennies are what scrolled really fast when you were filling up your gas tank. Now it is the dimes that scroll as fast as the pennies used to. I mean, that is how much things have changed. So dimes, you know, 10 dimes, that is a dollar. Bye-bye, every 10 dimes, another dollar gone.

And we have got to start moving energy policy, health care policy, the deficit in a new direction, which is what we would do with our innovation agenda. We would make sure that we commit to reaching energy independence through our midwestern, as opposed to the middle eastern dependence, through our ability to generate ethanol and invest in the research that would help us truly utilize ethanol as an energy resource.

Mr. DELAHUNT. If I could ask our chairman from Florida, just to raise once more that chart.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. This one?

Mr. DELAHUNT. Right. You know what I find interesting is, you pointed it out. It is the first time I have heard it, that you can't use that particular credit card, a Mobil credit card, did you say?

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Yes. It says you cannot use your Mobil credit card, and then it has another sticker that says, not a Mobil product. But at the same time, neither are the potato chips, neither are the cigarettes, neither is a six-pack of beer.

Mr. DELAHUNT. Right. But it is at a Mobil station?

Mr. MEEK of Florida. That's correct, yes, sir.

Mr. DELAHUNT. Okay. But it is not a Mobil product. And you interpret it, as I did, as a way to discourage people from using a fuel source that, over time, could wean us from that mid-eastern oil and allow us to rely, again, once more on that farmer, that American farmer from the Midwest?

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Yes, sir.

Mr. DELAHUNT. Okay. That is what we are talking about. That is really what we are talking about.

But you know what I find interesting? You raised it here in our conversation this evening. But has anybody, any chairman, if you are aware of any committee, standing committee of this House with this majority, requested or invited or insisted that the chairman of ExxonMobil come before it to explain to us and to the American people why does that product have that sticker about it when it is at a Mobil station? Just a simple question to educate us.

And it is clear that if it is a question that is not being asked by the majority, then nothing will change. And I would suggest it is the responsibility of this Congress and its committees to ask those questions because the American people deserve answers. And we are abrogating, we are not meeting our responsibility of oversight when those questions are not posed; and they are not being asked in this House of Representatives at this moment in our history, and it is a disgrace.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Look, the retirement package, Lee Raymond, CEO of Exxon, \$398 million retirement package. He gets a \$2 million tax break. So it is bad enough you are already subsidizing his business to the tune of \$14 or \$15 billion.

And this is the kind of disparity, we have the highest disparity between the wealthiest people in the country and the poorest people in the country since the 1920s, that is going like this. And the whole idea is to try to lift all the boats up into the middle class.

And we were talking earlier about the economy. This is, again, third-party validator, as we begin to wrap up. The long term, because we get a lot of happy talk, but the long-term outlook is such a deep well of sorrow that I can't get much happiness out of this year. That's a former director of the Congressional Budget Office that used to work for President Bush. It is such a deep well of sorrow.

This country is going in the wrong direction, whether you are talking about oil or Medicare or the war or Katrina or whatever, and my friend has got his toy there. This country is going in the wrong direction and we want to go in another direction.

If you like the neoconservative agenda that has been implemented, look around, gas, oil, retirements, pensions, minimum wage, Social Security, college tuition, keep the Republicans in office.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Mr. RYAN, just very quickly, the bottom line is, Mr. DELAHUNT, to your point, sir, the reason why the chairman hasn't called ExxonMobil in, the reason why everything that we have described here today is that we are on the total opposite side of their position.

We are not willing to rubber stamp everything that the President and the administration says must happen in this Congress. We are not willing to rubber stamp the special interests just because they are contributors to a particular campaign or something.

We are willing to stand up for the American people. And the reason why we have this rubber stamp down here on the floor, just to illustrate exactly what the Republican Congress has done, and that is the reason why we are in the situation we are in now.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. I just think, at the end of the day, we need to stress that in November, when we have the opportunity to take the majority of this institution, we will move the country in a new direction.

We will make sure that we make a commitment to reducing the deficit and reduce it. We will expand access to health care. We will actually invest in alternative energy resources so that we can truly reduce gas prices. And we will make sure that the American people know that their Representatives are here for them and not for the special interests.

Mr. RYAN.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. And even in the first couple of days, we will raise the minimum wage and cut college loan interest rates in half for parents and students. Just in the first couple of days, once we get this signed into law, we will recognize a huge difference.

Www.housedemocrats.gov/30something. All of the charts that we have here can be accessed on the Web site. Wwww.housedemocrats.gov/30something.

It has been a real pleasure.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Mr. RYAN, you did such an excellent job with the Web site.

I want to thank Mr. DELAHUNT for coming down and joining us this evening. We know that he could not join us yesterday evening.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, always a pleasure working with you here on the floor and off the floor.

What is good for the American people; and with that, Mr. Speaker, we thank the Democratic leadership.

EMBRYONIC STEM CELL RESEARCH

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WILSON of South Carolina). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2005, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. BARTLETT) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, we have appeared here on the floor several times to talk about a subject which is very important to a number of Americans, particularly those with some debilitating diseases that they believe might be cured with technology developed from embryonic stem cells.

I have had the privilege of having several Members of the House to work with me in developing the legislation that we are going to talk about tonight. And one of those Members is Congressman TOM OSBORNE from Nebraska, who is here with us this evening. And I would like to yield to him.

Mr. OSBORNE. Thank you very much, Mr. BARTLETT. I really appreciate your leadership on this issue. And you are obviously the expert.

Mr. BARTLETT is a geneticist and understands the topic very well. I would just like to set the stage for some of the debate tonight.

Many of us have been impacted directly or indirectly by diseases like juvenile diabetes, Alzheimer's, Lou Gehrig's disease, Parkinson's and so on. And so I think everyone understands the desire for people to find a cure. And for many people, the silver bullet is embryonic stem cell research. And they feel this holds great promise. It has been going on now for about 7 years. We have not seen great progress, but it is still early in the process. So, as a result, there are many people who are pushing very hard for embryonic stem cell research.

On the other hand, many oppose embryonic stem cell research because they see the embryo as a living, viable human being; and therein lies the moral dilemma. On the one hand, people see the possibilities and on the other hand they see the destruction of life. And so is there a possible solution? Where do we come out on this?

If you believe that life begins at conception and if you believe in the sanctity of life, the destruction of embryos for research purposes would be largely unacceptable. And so, Mr. BARTLETT's legislation holds great interest to me, because we have found that there is a possible alternative.

The President has said that he will veto H.R. 810, which is a stem cell research bill. And if it is passed by the Senate, and people predict that it will be passed, then it will probably be vetoed by the President. And at that point, it appears as though the House will sustain that veto and probably the Senate as well. So we are right back to square one.

So is there an alternative? And that is why I am here tonight.

As many people may be aware by now, there is still the potential for a morally acceptable stem cell research to be conducted with Federal funds through the Bartlett bill. And evidently there is a process at the present time whereby embryonic stem cells can be extracted, and it is still in its elemental stages, without destroying the embryo. So I have great interest in this because it does provide an answer to the dilemma that I have just outlined.

And so, without a lot of further commentary from me, being somewhat of an amateur in the area, I would defer to Mr. BARTLETT, because he truly understands this research, which I think can be the answer that so many of us are looking for.

I personally am a very strong prolife individual, have voted consistently in that direction. And so I welcome this opportunity to look at a prolife solution to embryonic stem cell research.

I appreciate the gentleman's work on this bill, appreciate his knowledge, his expertise, which is certainly unparalleled in the Congress.

And with that, I just wanted to make those opening preparatory remarks and lend my support to this bill and this work that you are doing, and thank you for doing it.

□ 1930

This is all probably going to come to a head here in the next week or so; so this is a critical time. And what I think and others are trying to do is to create awareness and to make sure that people in the Congress understand the nature of the research that he is proposing.

So I commend you for your work. I want to wish you the very best, and hopefully in the next week or 10 days, we will see some positive results. So thank you for your leadership.

Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I thank the gentleman for his support, for his leadership on this, and for his kind words.

I was fortunate in another life, before I came to the Congress, to have the privilege of working in this general area. I have a doctorate in human physiology, and I had the privilege of

teaching medical school for 5 years and doing biomedical research. And when I came to the Congress and learned of the interest in stem cells, with my background I saw some opportunities for applications here that may not have been apparent to others, and I have been pursuing this now for some 5 years with the White House and with the National Institutes of Health.

We are here tonight, Mr. Speaker, because it is our understanding that within a few days, probably next week and maybe early next week, the Senate is going to be voting on three bills, two of them relevant to this, the third somewhat tangential to it.

One of the bills they will be voting on is the bill that we passed here in the Congress here in the House some time ago. It is known as the Castle bill here generally, Castle-DeGette bill. This is the bill that the President says that if it gets to his desk, as Congressman OSBORNE indicated, he will veto it because this is a bill that would use surplus embryos from the fertility clinics, and they would be destroyed in the process of securing cells from them to produce these stem cell lines, although there is the anticipation, the hope, that a great deal of medical good might come from embryonic stem cell applications.

There is a concern of many in our society, which I share, that it is not morally acceptable to destroy one life in the hopes that you will help another life. So I had hoped that there would be an alternative to this, that we could look forward to enjoying the potential benefits of embryonic stem cell applications without having to kill embryos.

And that is what we are here to talk about this evening, because the second bill that the Senate will be voting on next week is a bill that is essentially identical to the one that we have been working on and developing now for these 5 years. The bill that we will vote on in the House, we hope, shortly after it is voted on in the Senate, will be a companion bill to the Senate bill and essentially the bill that we have been working on for these 5 years.

I would first like to take a look at a chart here which shows, in very gross form, the developmental sequence and the origin of what we call stem cells so that we can get a little appreciation of what a stem cell is so that we can understand the difference between adult stem cells and embryonic stem cells and the potential that these hold.

Here we have a very abbreviated development process. It begins with what is called the zygote. The zygote is produced by the union of two sex cells, which technically are called gametes. And the zygote then goes to a number of cell divisions. And, boy, did they skip a lot here because we have just one cell and here we have several hundred cells; so it is divided again and again before you get to this point. And this is the point of the inner cell mass. And in that inner cell mass which will

become the embryo, we have the first differentiation of these very primordial cells here into three distinct cell types: one is the ectoderm and another is the mesoderm and the third one is the endoderm.

There is a fourth cell type there, limited in number and location, and these are the germ cells. These will be the ova, produced in the female, and the sperm, produced in the male. What we have here depicted is the embryo implanted in the wall of the uterus. This is the uterus and this is the embryo and the so-called dissidua, the tissues that surround and support the embryo. Only this part of it here will become the baby. The rest of this will be the supporting tissues, the amnion and the corion, that support the baby.

In each of these germ layers, and we call these germ layers because they are three layers, three types of cells from which all of the tissues and organs of the body will develop, the ectoderm will produce our skin and our nervous system, and the mesoderm will produce the great bulk of our bodies. It will produce all of the muscle cells, our heart, the blood system, the smooth muscle cells of our gut and so forth. All of these will be produced from the so-called mesoderm. The endoderm, much limited in quantity in the body but not in importance, our lungs, much of our lungs, the lining of our intestines, and so forth are produced from the endoderm.

Every student in even a pretty elementary biology class will be familiar with one type of stem cell, and these are the stem cells that produce our blood cells because you can see those very readily in the adult. They are located in bone marrow, in the shafts of our ribs and so forth, and they produce our red blood cells, the little thrombocytes that produce the clotting of blood, and the polymorphonuclear leukocytes. These are the leukocytes with a funny shaped nucleus. And they are called stem cells because from a single cell type, this will differentiate into several types of blood cells, most of the blood cells. There are a couple of white blood cells that are produced in lymphatic tissue, but most of the blood cells are produced from these single stem cells.

Most of the other tissues here are also produced from stem cells because it is a single cell, the ectodermal cell, the differentiations of these several types of cells.

All of these types of cells are adult stem cells, and they have the limitation of already having differentiated. They already are differentiated so that under ordinary circumstances only certain tissues will ever be produced from them. If you can go into the body and take out an ectodermal stem cell, unless you are clever and make that cell believe that it is something that it is not, it will produce only tissues that relate to the ectoderm, cells of our nervous system and cells of our integument, or our skin.

Similarly for the mesodermal cells, if you can get a stem cell even before it is a stem cell for blood, back here you can get a stem cell from which all of these mesodermal tissues will develop, but you could never get ectodermal tissue from that nor could you get endodermal tissue from that; so you are somewhat limited as to the types of tissues that you might develop from an adult stem cell.

But if you could go back to the embryonic stem cell, and you may have to go back even before this stage of development, when the embryonic stem cells are undifferentiated, which means they haven't started to become a specific type of cell, you then could theoretically produce from those cells any and all of the tissues of the body. So there are a number of different diseases where the medical profession treating them and the loved ones of the families believe that there could be dramatic applications made from embryonic stem cells.

Every year I look forward to the juvenile diabetic people coming through my office. These are such heroic little kids that I see. Some of them so brittle that they have an insulin pump and they have to puncture their fingers or their earlobe a dozen times a day or more to keep track of their insulin because they are so fragile, so brittle, they can go from very low glucose to very high glucose with life-threatening changes.

Then the people come through the office who have friends and relatives who have Parkinson's disease, who have Alzheimer's disease, and any of the autoimmune diseases where the body's defenses have been confused so that the body is attacking its own tissues. And it is believed that in all of these different kinds of diseases that embryonic stem cell applications might produce dramatic effects.

I just returned from a family reunion. And my cousin's husband, who was a pathologist here in the Washington area, Washington Adventist Hospital in Shady Grove, for years, retired and went to Florida and very shortly came down with Parkinson's disease. I recognized him from his smile. Other than that, it would have been hard to recognize him because of the wasting of his body that has occurred with Parkinson's disease. And the mind, of course, is still very alert. It is just the mechanical part of the body that is deteriorating.

And Dr. Teske, Johnny Teske, we were talking about stem cells, embryonic stem cells, and he says, "Time is of the essence." And I kind of choked up a little when he said that because here is a person who really understands this. He is a pathologist. He knows what he has got, and he knows what his future is going to be, and what he was telling me is that if I am going to benefit from this, you have got to do it quickly.

So I hope, Mr. Speaker, that we are able to move quickly on this in the

House. It is our understanding that the Senate will be moving quickly on it. I mentioned that several of our colleagues here have been working with us and helping on it. And one that I am very pleased has been helping us is someone who is really familiar with this subject because he is a physician who has delivered a lot of babies. He gets involved down the line from here after all of these tissues have been developed and we have that little baby at 9 months in the womb. And this is Dr. GINGREY from Georgia.

I am very pleased that he has joined us and would like to yield to him.

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Speaker, I deeply appreciate the gentleman from Maryland for yielding. And I just want to say, as my good friend and our colleague Coach OSBORNE said at the outset, ROSCOE BARTLETT deserves a lot of credit for this bill, H.R. 5526. And it has not been easy. You heard him say, Mr. Speaker, that he has been working on this issue for over 5 years, has met with the Bioethics Commission, the President's Bioethics Commission, to discuss this issue, discuss this issue with the White House, understanding, as he said just a few moments ago, that while we want to search for that miraculous medical breakthrough, that cure, that hopefully we can obtain either from adult or umbilical cord blood stem cells or the even greater potential for utilizing embryonic stem cells to save human life, to save the people that he was just talking about, Mr. Speaker.

And, indeed, I am sure you know this as well as the other Members that these folks do come by and talk to us on an annual basis, whether they are juvenile diabetics or Parkinson's, as he described, Alzheimer's. I think often of children born with something called spina bifida, where there is an open defect in the spine. One of these germ cell layers that ROSCOE was just talking about, the ectoderm, something goes awry in the developmental process, in the fetal stage of development, and these children are born perfectly normal in every way except for this defect, which in almost every instance leaves them with a permanent, noncurable paralysis usually from the waist down.

□ 1945

That not only affects their lower extremities, but of course, it affects the function of bowel and bladder in these otherwise perfect, perfect children, and yet their lifespan is drastically shortened because of the complication of this birth defect.

I have lain awake more than one night thinking about what might be done, whether it is a surgical technique or a medication. Obviously, it would be great if these birth defects never occurred, if we knew exactly what caused that birth defect, but we do not. We just do not, and so to be able to develop something, some way of helping these children and people with other diseases that the gentleman from Maryland has

just described is a passion of mine as a physician.

To come to this Congress, as I did 3½ years ago in the 108th, and to meet other Members of this body on both sides of the aisle, but in particular Representative BARTLETT, and understand that he has a knowledge of this subject far beyond probably any physician Member, ROSCOE BARTLETT of course is a doctor. He is a Ph.D. He has taught embryology in medical school. Physiology, he is a physiologist, and the subject matter of which he is describing and talking about this evening, he has done so over the last several years, and it is amazing how he can put that, Mr. Speaker, in a simplistic terminology, with charts but with a very lucid explanation so that we, other Members on both sides of the aisle in both chambers, can understand and the general public who hopefully are watching can understand because the sound byte becomes reality.

This issue revolves around the use of embryonic stem cells, embryonic stem cells to hopefully result in these medical cures, these miracles that we hope will be there in our lifetime.

Mr. Speaker, we have a President that feels very strongly about that, that has great passion and compassion. But what he has said, and I heard him loud and clear shortly before I became a Member of this august body, when he made a decision not to destroy human life for the sake of hopefully some miraculous medical cure.

You could almost compare it to what our military commanders do and the decisions that they make. I know that the Speaker tonight particularly understands that with his military service and that of his sons serving in the military, but you try as hard as you can to avoid collateral damage in the military. The last thing you want to do in going after the enemy and taking him out is to inadvertently destroy or injure the life of a civilian.

Well, this is getting right down to the core of this matter of what Representative BARTLETT is so concerned about. We want to be able to improve human life and relieve the suffering of our fellow brothers and sisters, but at the same time, we do not want to destroy a life in the process.

That destruction of life, whether it is a little embryo from one of these infertility clinics or, indeed, whether at some point somebody extends that destruction of human life to a senior citizen at the other extreme who may have lost most of their, not all of their, but most of their mental capacity, I would hope, Mr. Speaker, that if we knew that we could obtain a cell from the brain of a senior citizen who is suffering from senility and use that as a stem cell to cure somebody else's disease but in the process kill that individual, no one would accept that, I would hope, I would think, I would pray, and I think not.

So this is really what this is all about. ROSCOE BARTLETT knows and

has finally convinced his colleagues, I think certainly in this body, but also in the other body, that there is a better way, that there is indeed a better way and that we can obtain these pluripotential stem cells, not totipotential because I know some would say if it is a totipotential, that it is an embryo in and of itself.

But this bill has the precept of saying we can fund research that will allow the harvesting of stem cells without destroying human life, and anybody that suggests that the embryos that are so-called left over from the fertility clinics are throwaway embryos, are going to be flushed down the drain anyway and it is okay to churn them up and centrifuge out some stem cells and destroy that human life, that it does not matter, needs to talk to the parents of the snowflake babies, some of them 3 and 4 years old now, I think close to 100, who have been adopted from those parents that own those embryos, those so-called excess throwaway embryos.

So there is a better way, and we do not need to get into this debate about who is pro-life and who is pro-choice and all of that. If we can do this in the Bartlett way, H.R. 5526 is the way to do it, and it is a companion bill to what Senator SANTORUM has introduced in the Senate. I am just thrilled to learn that Dr. FRIST will allow that bill, as well as the Castle-DeGette bill and the Brownback bill to be brought to the floor of the Senate, it is my understanding next week, voted on. Possibly all three of those bills, Mr. Speaker, will pass, and then the President will have an opportunity, after we pass the companion bill to H.R. 5526, to do the right thing.

Then I think the Members of this body will sustain if the President vetoes the Castle-DeGette bill, which, again, I am not criticizing the authors, but there is no question that it goes back and allows taxpayer dollars, mine, my constituents in the 11th of Georgia, ROSCOE BARTLETT's constituents, with their hard-earned money to pay for research that results in the destruction of human life, and we reject that.

So I am thrilled that the 4 years of hard work that Representative BARTLETT has put into this issue is finally going to come to fruition and we are going to get good results from utilizing these stem cells that are obtained.

I know that he will begin in just a moment, as I conclude, to talk about the different techniques of how that can be done, and I think our colleagues can understand it because he explains it well. It is not rocket science. It is not something that is star wars, but it is real and it is the way to do it.

So I am real happy to be here tonight to once again join my colleague who I have such great affection for, not just him personally but the issue that he has taken on and the hurdles that he has had to go through, and I commend him for that.

Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman very much. Not only do these snowflake babies speak to us, the snowflake babies are the babies that were produced by the parents of the excess embryos, giving these embryos to a mother who could not have a baby. They were implanted in her womb, and we now have more than 100 of those. They were here, by the way, a year or so ago. A number of snowflake babies were here in the Congress and in the White House.

But I think there is something else that speaks to us, too, and that is that before you would harvest the cells from one of these embryos by destroying the embryo, you would want to know that it was a healthy embryo, and you would have it under the microscope and you are looking at it. You want to make sure it is a healthy embryo because you want to have stem cell lines that will be really healthy.

When you are looking at that embryo under there, it ought to occur to you that that could be the next Albert Einstein or the next Beethoven, and you are not now looking at 400,000 surplus embryos in the fertility clinics. You are looking at that one embryo under your microscope. That embryo ought to speak to you. It could be the next Albert Einstein. It could be the next Beethoven, and how could you kill the next Albert Einstein or the next Beethoven? Fortunately, as Dr. Gingrey said, there is a way of getting embryonic stem cells without destroying embryos.

The President was not unmindful of the potential for embryonic stem cell research, and he really wanted the medical community to benefit from embryonic stem cell research. So, quite immediately after he issued his executive order saying that they could use Federal money only for research on those stem cell lines that had already been established, those stem cell lines now are running out, as we knew they would, and a few weeks, months ago, there were 21, 22 or so left, maybe fewer than that left now. We started out with maybe 60.

Very shortly after the President issued his executive order, he set up a council on bioethics, and they issued a report. I have here a copy of that report, and they detailed and discussed at quite some length, it is very interesting reading, and I think even the layman could appreciate most of it. They discussed four different potential ways of getting embryonic stem cells as the equivalent of an embryonic stem cell without destroying or hurting an embryo.

The second one of those that they talked about, you will see a little asterisk there, and you go to the bottom of the page, and you will see the notation that Congressman BARTLETT suggested this technique before the bioethics committee met. A little later, I will indicate to you how I came to have my first discussion with the President on this and how we now made that 5-year journey from then to now.

What I have here in this slide is a depiction of the reproductive tract of the female, and what we will be talking about is what goes on in a dish in the laboratory that I think is a whole lot easier to understand what is going on if we look at this process in this depiction of the mother's reproductive tract.

Here in the corner here we see the total reproductive tract which has the vagina and the cervix and the uterus and the two fallopian tubes, and each fallopian tube ending in a funnel-like structure called infundibulum, and there is the ovary and the blow-up here is only one-half of this reproductive tract. So there is a mirror image on the other half of it. This shows what happens in the fertilization and the early development of the embryo.

Once a month ordinarily, an ovum ripens and is released from the ovary, and if sperm had been deposited in the reproductive tract, they then travel up the reproductive tract. The egg is fertilized very quickly, very soon after it is released from the ovary.

Now, sometimes the egg is not picked up by the infundibulum, and it floats out into the body. Many of these sperm will make it clear through the reproductive tract and go out into the body where they will simply be absorbed later, but they may find the ovum out there and fertilize the ovum. Then the ovum will do what it does in the reproductive tract. It will divide again and again, and we will look at that in a moment.

At the appropriate time, it will find someplace to implant, and since it is out here in the body cavity, it will implant on one of the body tissues, and we call this an ectopic pregnancy, and that pregnancy will threaten the life of the mother. The baby cannot develop fully there, and the baby will die and the mother, too, if this is not interrupted.

□ 2000

At other times, as the egg, fertilized egg goes down the reproductive track here, it may implant along the tube here. And we call that a tubal pregnancy. And that tube is nowhere near big enough to accommodate a baby growing. So the baby will die, and the mother possibly too if we do not interrupt that pregnancy.

But most of the time, and nature is really quite a marvel, most of the time the egg is fertilized here high up in the fallopian tube and then it begins a several day journey. And here we have the days marked. Day 4, day 5 and day 6 and 7 and day 8 and 9. It is a bit more than a week after it is released from the ovum and fertilized, and day zero here begins the fertilization. It makes its way down the reproductive track.

No motility of its own, it is moved along by little cilia, little hair-like projections on the wall of the oviduct, which move in wavelike fashion and move the ovum down. As it moves down, it divides. First into two cells, then four cells, and then into 8 cells,

and we will come back to that 8-cell stage, because that is an important one.

Then it goes on to divide further to a number of cells, and finally to the inner cell mass that we found on that first slide. And then it implants in the uterus.

And the mother's uterus produces some tissue and the little embryo produces some tissues, we call these the decidua. And they develop the placenta and the amnion. They are filled with fluids and support the baby and protect it during its development.

When eggs are taken from the laboratory, and all of this by the way can happen in the laboratory in a Petri dish, they simply take the egg from the mother, generally produced by hormone treatment that causes multiple ovulations, so that there are a number of eggs. There may be 6, 8, 10 eggs are produced by the mother. They will fertilize those in a dish in the laboratory, a Petri dish, in vitro, that means in glass.

This is in vivo, that means in life. The in vitro fertilization, they then will divide and the doctors watch them divide. And if they are going to harvest these for stem cells they generally wait to the inner cell mass stage down here and take them out. And the reason for that is that these cells do not like to be alone. And you have to be clever to get one of them to divide.

So they take them when they have lots of company after there is a number of cells in the inner cell mass. They take these cells and destroy the embryo in the process.

There is a technique used, first in laboratories in England, and then in this country, and I spent more than a half hour on the phone with two of the physicians in the one here in Virginia, where they go to the 8-cell stage, and this is all in a Petri dish in a laboratory now.

And they take a cell, and sometimes they get 2 cells from the 8-cell stage, and they do a preimplantation genetic diagnosis on that to make sure that the baby is not going to have some genetic deficiencies like Trisomy 21. You generally know it as Mongolism. And that is when just one of the chromosomes, there are three of them there. And if there are three of those chromosomes there, there are various degrees of Trisomy 21, but the baby then will be affected by that.

And you would like to have, most parents would like to have a normal baby. So they can do a preimplantation genetic diagnosis, and then they implant the remaining seven and sometimes six cells. And more than 2,000 times now, what appears to be a perfectly normal baby has been produced from that. I will have a slide a little later to show this.

But I would just like to note for now that that is no big surprise. In fact, the big surprise to me would be that the baby was not normal, because nature, for as long as we have had people here,

and happens in animals too, but nature has been doing exactly this, but they take not just one or two cells away, nature takes half the cells away. And from each half, nature grows a perfectly normal baby, and we call them identical twins.

So if nature can take half of the cells away and each half develops into a perfectly normal baby, it ought to be that you can take a cell or two away and the embryo would not even know it. If it does not know that half of the cells are gone, if it goes on and develops into a perfectly normal baby, each half does, why should it be affected at all if you take only one or two cells?

So the big surprise to me would have been if there was any effect of this on the baby. And it is that technique which had occurred to me earlier. But to kind of put this in perspective, I would like to look at the next slide. And this next slide, this next chart up depicts some of things that we have been talking about and some additional ones.

This is the fertilization process. We saw that in that former slide. But we did not see there the early development of the gametes or the sex cells. And they develop in the seminiferous tubules in the male, and in the ova of the female, those cells divide and divide again.

And most of these divisions are what we call mitotic divisions, that the chromosomes split so that the same number of chromosomes remain in the daughter cells. But in one of these processes there is a meiotic division called meiosis where the chromosomes do not divide, so that when the cells split, each daughter cell has only half as many chromosomes.

You see, that is necessary because the chromosomes are going to be joined from the female and from the male, and you now need to end up with the right number of chromosomes, not twice as many chromosomes. Because if that happened, the embryo would certainly die.

By the way, it is really interesting that in plants, when you have what is called polyploidy, that is what this is called when you have polyploidy, which is more than the diploid, which is the double, and there is a haploid number here, and there is a diploid number when the two haploids come together.

In plants it just makes them bigger and prettier, and the flowers brighter colored and so forth. That works well for plants, but for humans and all other animals, by the way it is fatal.

So this depicts the fertilization process and they combine to form the embryo, and then the embryo divides again and again. And we see there the same types of depictions that we saw previously.

The second little sequence here shows cloning. And Dolly the sheep was the first clone that the public knew about anyway that was produced. In cloning what happens is, that you take an egg cell, and you take the nucleus

from the egg cell. You remove the nucleus, so now you have an egg cell with no nucleus there. And then you take a nucleus from a donor cell. This is a general somatic. By soma, that means body, somatic cell. You take the nucleus from that cell, and you put it inside the egg cell.

Now all of the genetic material is not in the nucleus. Most of the genetic material that determines who you are, whether you are male or female, tall or short, blond or brunette, going to be tall and thin or short and stout, most of that is in the nucleus. But in the cytoplasm here are a lot of control factors. Ribonucleic Acid, so called RNA and then messages are sent back and forth between the cytoplasm and the nucleus.

And so there are a lot of control factors here in the cytoplasm that when this nucleus from a skin cell or whatever is put inside this egg cell, it is controlled by these control factors in the cytoplasm under appropriate circumstances, so that it now behaves as if it were an embryonic cell. And that is because of the control factors here.

Of course, what the offspring is going to look like now is what the individual looked like from which the donor cell was taken. I was privileged to go to a little dairy in my district that is probably unique in all of the world. He happened to have the best Holstein cow in America, which probably means the best Holstein cow in the world, because we have some of the best cattle in the world.

Her name was Zena. And a cloning company wanted to work with him. And so he cloned two daughters of Zena. And then Zena broke her back and she had to be put down. But he had Zena's daughters. It was very interesting. The daughters did not look exactly like Zena. Why shouldn't they? And that is because of the black and white pigment, the general distribution, whether they are mostly white or mostly black is controlled by the genes.

But the actual pattern is kind of an accident of development. And so the two daughters had exactly the same genetic composition as their mother, looked somewhat different. They both had roughly the same amount of black and white, but it was distributed a little differently. And so you could see there the effects of the factors at work during the development of the embryo.

The third little sequence down here shows us parthenogenesis. Parthenogenesis is when an offspring develops just from the ova. That can only happen if this meiotic division does not occur, because the ovum has to, and it says that here, induce the egg to keep all of its chromosomes. This is kind of easy to do with salamanders and frogs and so forth. There is a lot of parthenogenic embryonic studies that are done with these, with these animals.

But now of course it is going to have exactly the same genetic makeup as the mother. I do not know if we ever

have a documented case of this happening in humans. But you can certainly induce it in some of the lower animals.

The next chart now shows us the four processes, the potential sources of stem cells that were described here in the white paper produced by the President's Council on Bioethics, called alternative sources of human pluripotent stem cells. Dr. GINGREY used the term pluripotent. I would like to note just for a moment what that means.

The embryo itself, when it is first fertilized, is totipotent, it can produce any and all cells, including the decidua. These are the cells that will produce the amnion and corion to support the embryo. By the time it gets to several divisions, even the eight-cell stage, it has now become only pluripotent. A single cell will not be able to produce all of the tissues of the body.

If it could produce everything, maybe produce all of the tissues of the body, but not the decidua, if it could produce all of those, it would simply, as Dr. GINGREY mentioned, be another embryo and the ethical argument would start all over.

But it is my understanding, and I was pleased to learn this, because I did not know before I got involved in this, I do not think that we knew until very recently with research, when the embryo went from totipotent to pluripotent, but you do not want totipotent cells, you want only pluripotent cells; that is why the name of this article.

There are several different techniques, four of them, and three of them are shown here. The last one will be on the next slide. Altered nuclear transfer. This is an interesting one. You will see that it looks very much like the cloning.

But what they do before they put the donor cell is they turn out, turn off some of the genes in the donor cell. Generally they are the genes that would produce the decidua. So you do not end up with an embryo, you end up with a mass of dividing cells that have all of the cell types the embryo would have, but they are not organized as an embryo.

So the argument is made that since it is not an embryo, you can take the cells from it. And then you turn the gene back on, because in your stem cell line, you want to have a normal cell, so you turn the gene back on.

There is another variant of this, which is interesting and might have less ethical arguments. Because the ethical argument here might be that you are simply producing a deformed fetus. If a fetus is born deformed, you do not take it and kill it, so why should you kill this? You have intentionally deformed it.

Now the proponents of this will argue that it is really not a fetus because it has no chance of ever developing into a baby. But that argument kind of goes away if you use this technique.

Because what they do here is to enhance the cells that produce the embryonic stem cell growth so that it cannot produce the whole baby.

□ 2015

You haven't disrupted, changed the embryonic makeup; you simply enhanced the activity of some of the cells. So this altered nuclear transfer oocyte-assisted reprogramming is what it is called. And obviously we need a lot of animal experimentation, which is what the bill provides for.

This is the technique that I had suggested to the President. I met him at an event shortly after I went to NIH, and I talked to some of the doctors there. They had an open laboratory there and invited the staff out and Members out. I think I was probably the only Member that was there.

But they were talking about the potential of embryonic stem cell research. They didn't know what position the President was going to take; and of course you can't get inside their head, but my feeling was that they believed that the President was going to permit the use of surplus embryos and use Federal money for that. He, of course, did not do that.

But I asked them during this discussion, if in the development of identical twins you can take half the cells away and each half produces a perfectly normal baby, why shouldn't you be able to take one or two cells away to produce a stem cell line from, and then the rest of the embryo would produce a perfectly normal baby? And they said, yes, that ought to be possible.

And this is just depicted here. You have taken a cell away and you developed it into an embryonic stem cell line. That is easier said than done, because these cells don't like to be alone. And now two doctors say they have done it; Verlinksy and Lanza both say that they have successfully developed a stem cell line from a single cell. But both of them did it creatively by giving this cell some company, and after developing a sufficient number of like cells, they then could take the company cells away, and they had a pure embryonic stem cell line.

The last one here is a really interesting one, and that is the idea that you could take cells from an embryo which was clinically dead, like a person could be clinically dead but their organs are still good; that is how we do organ transplants. So maybe there is a time when an embryo is clinically dead, but the cells are still alive. It does not have the organizational capacity to produce an embryo, but yet the cells are still alive. There has been a lot of research on this, and, yes, that is a possibility.

The argument might be, gee, what kind of confidence could you have? You have got a good stem cell line from an embryo that was dead? But the counterargument would be, and one of our colleagues has a lung transplant here in the House and one of my very

good friends here had a double lung transplant and lived with it for a long number of years, and both of those came from people who were clinically dead.

The next chart shows a really interesting one. And if this could be made to work, it is better than any of the others because you now would end up with embryonic stem cells that were a genetic match for the person that you were going to treat. And we won't take the time to go through these, but these are all techniques of trying to convince the donor cell, this is the donor, this is the guy with Parkinson's disease or the child with diabetes. You take the donor cell now and you use embryonic stem cell, the cytoplasm of the embryonic stem cell to confuse the donor cell nucleus so that it thinks it is an embryonic stem cell. And if you can do that, it is called de-differentiation, you have now taken the de-differentiated state, if you could do that, this would be the best of all worlds, because not only do you have a stem cell, you have a stem cell that is generically identical to the person you are going to treat so you don't have any rejection.

Now, we don't know if this is going to work or not, and what this bill does is to authorize the NIH to expend Federal funds to explore all of these techniques.

The next slide shows a phenomenon, and I would like to ask Dr. GINGREY to make a brief comment. We will be closing here in about 7 minutes, but this is what led me to believe that you could take cells from an early embryo without hurting it, because nature does this all the time. It is called identical twinning. Sometimes they divide at the two-cell stage and sometimes as late as the inner-cell mass stage. And my understanding is that you can tell when the division occurred by how they present. If they present at birth in a common amnion, the division probably occurred at the two-cell stage. If they present in the uterus with two different amnions, the division probably occurred at the inner-cell mass stage. And I would like to ask Dr. GINGREY, in his many deliveries, if he has had a chance to verify if this was true.

Mr. GINGREY. I thank the gentleman.

Indeed, it is true, Mr. Speaker, what he is describing. In fact, I can relate some personal experience to that. I think a lot of my colleagues know my wife and I had our fifth grandchild, but our oldest grandchildren are identical twin girls; they are 8 years old, and they were actually born at 26 weeks. They only weighed one pound, 12 ounces. And, Mr. Speaker, normally that situation is fraught with a lot of problems, and we were, of course, very blessed that they did well.

But what Representative BARTLETT is talking about is exactly right. And, as he said, in human nature, you get this division, and you may be dividing at the eight-cell stage, you may be dividing at the four-cell stage or the 16-

cell stage, and no harm is done. You are basically taking away 50 percent; it is almost like the wisdom of Solomon in dividing a child without harming either. And it is amazing what human nature can do.

And the gentleman said earlier that preimplantation diagnoses biopsy of the embryos so that you can avoid reimplanting an embryo that has a genetic defect that is incompatible with life. And these processes are being done, the gentleman referred to maybe a couple hundred cases that he was familiar with, with absolutely no harm. So this is exactly the right track, and so I do agree with your statement.

Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland. I thank the gentleman very much. I had forgotten that he had identical twins and is very familiar with this, not just as a physician but as a father.

I want to close with a note that a very fortuitous thing has happened, and let me put the next chart up that simply is a page from this White Paper that refers to this technique and that credits me with this proposal early in this process.

After I suggested this to the President, a very interesting thing had happened after that with a dialogue between Karl Rove and the White House, and they were, in effect, carrying out simultaneous monologues and thought they were dialoguing. And that very frequently happens, one of our big problems in this world, which is why, I guess, we have a State Department, because sometimes people think they are dialoguing and they really are carrying on simultaneous monologues.

But during this 5 years this technology has developed to the point that the British now are doing this preimplantation genetic diagnosis. And I am sure he won't mind if I mention his name. Richard Doerflinger made one of the greatest contributions to this dialogue of anybody when he suggested, "Roscoe, the first thing that you need to do with that cell that you take from this eight-cell stage is to establish a repair kit for the baby."

Now, we are kind of trying to do that with freezing cord blood. That is the reason you freeze cord blood, because later you may need it. That, by the way, is not embryonic stem cell; those are the adult stem cells. The baby's is an adult when it is born. As a matter of fact, the day you are born, you start to die. You are an adult when you are born. The embryonic is when you are first starting to develop; it is not an embryo, it is a fetus at that time. And the tissues are really in terms of the genetic development; they are adult tissues.

But if now the first thing that a parent does with that cell that is taken is to establish a repair kit and take a second cell, because the six cells that were implanted do just as well as the seven that were implanted, with the second cell, do a preimplantation genetic diagnosis, if they wish. But the critical thing is that we would get the stem

cell lines now from the surplus cells, from the repair kit.

So now I think that all ethical arguments disappear, because the parents are making two decisions that we are not a part of; we don't even get involved. They make a decision to have in vitro fertilization; then they make the decision to establish a repair kit. And only after the repair kit is established do we ask for some surplus cells from the repair kit.

I am very pleased that there is this possibility, because I understand, and I have a number of prolife friends who have decided that since these surplus embryos are going to be thrown away anyhow that you may as well try to get some medical benefit from them. That may be, for some, a compelling argument. And if I didn't believe that there was an alternative to that, it might be a more compelling argument.

But since there is an alternative to that and we don't have to offend the sensibilities of a large number of people in the country, and I am one of them; I am a little different, I guess, because I am a scientist and understand these things a little from that perspective, too. But I am devoutly prolife.

And I am just so pleased, Mr. Speaker, that we will have the opportunity shortly in the House as they are doing in the Senate to vote on a bill that can go to the President's desk, where he can sign the bill and say, I am really happy that we have here a bill that gives all of the promise of embryonic stem cell research without destroying or even hurting embryos.

VACATING 5-MINUTE SPECIAL ORDER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the 5-minute special order of the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS) is vacated.

There was no objection.

AVIAN INFLUENZA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2005, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS) is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. BURGESS. I thank the Speaker for that consideration.

Mr. Speaker, I wanted to come to the floor tonight to speak just a little bit about a situation that we have had to address here in Congress, and we likely will have to think about it some more over the coming year or years, and that is the issue of avian influenza.

The important thing to remember when we talk about bird flu, or avian influenza, is, there are different types of flu. We are all familiar with the common type of influenza, the one that we all get a flu shot for or should get a flu shot for every year. And the reason we have to be vaccinated every year is because there are modest changes that occur in the genetic

makeup of this virus year in and year out, a so-called genetic drift.

Avian flu refers to a virus that is currently present only in birds, but has on occasion made the transition to a human host with rather significant effects. This reflects a bigger genetic change than can occur in the flu virus from time to time, a so-called genetic shift. This could become a major health threat to humans.

As of June 20, 2006, the World Health Organization has confirmed 228 human cases with 130 deaths. It doesn't take much to do the math to see that that is a mortality rate in excess of 50 percent for this virus.

Now, the trouble signs that are already present. We do have the virus present in birds; there is a wide geographic setting with involvement of other animals, including cats and tigers. Bird-to-human transmission has occurred, but it has occurred only with inefficiency; and there has been on occasion, through close household contact, inefficient human-to-human transmission.

Steps one through four have occurred since 1997, and I must stress, they have occurred in the Eastern Hemisphere of the world. There have been no reported cases in birds or humans in the Western Hemisphere.

The last step in this process, the efficient human-to-human transmission of this virus, has not occurred. If that step does occur, and it is certainly not certain that it will, but if that step does occur, that would trigger the onset of the possibility of pandemic flu.

One of the big problems that we have with this virus, as humans, is that we have no underlying immunity to this virus, so that if the virus is introduced to the community where it can spread easily from person to person, it could progress very rapidly through the population.

Now, pandemics are not new phenomena; they occur and have occurred over the centuries. They happen about every 35 years, approximately three per century. And, indeed, in the 20th century there were three such epidemics. In 1918, the so-called Spanish flu killed 50 million people worldwide. In 1957, the Asiatic flu killed 170,000 people in the United States. And, in 1968, the Hong Kong flu killed 35,000 people in the United States.

What would happen if a pandemic flu were to reemerge? The Department of Health and Human Services estimates that for a moderate outbreak like the Asian flu pandemic in 1957, we could see over 200,000 deaths in this country. In a worst-case scenario, such as the Spanish flu pandemic in 1918, almost 2 million deaths would be estimated to occur in the United States.

□ 2030

Mr. Speaker, I have a couple of maps that show some of the progression of this illness across the globe. Looking here at this first map, the eastern part

of the world, avian flu cases are depicted in blue, human cases in black. On this map you will see almost 50 countries that have been involved with avian flu in bird populations and a smaller number, 10 countries, have reported human cases which have moved with some difficulty from birds to humans.

Looking at a map that shows the progression of this illness in birds, we see that in Hong Kong in 1997 when the disease was first reported, there has been a gradual progression westward since that time. June of 2004, the disease had progressed to Vietnam. June of 2005, the disease was reported in Iraq. In 2006, Turkey. In March of 2006, it had made an appearance in Egypt, and the progression is westward.

This inset map on the bottom, the orange lines, and it is difficult to see, but that outlines the places where bird populations, domestic bird populations, poultry populations and human populations tend to overlap. You can see in the areas in China and Vietnam and Southeast Asia where that appears to have been a significant issue, and you can see some areas of the United States that would be at risk if bird flu actually spread to this country.

To date, the disease has been endemic in birds and over 200 million birds have been culled in the last 3 years. This is significant in that there are many parts of the world that rely on poultry as literally a means of currency, and this has been a very difficult thing for some countries to accomplish. But a critical aspect of the prevention of the disease is if we can stop it in birds and never have to worry about it in humans, it is going to be much, much better for us as a people.

Let me take these out of the way for a moment and demonstrate one of the issues that is so striking about this illness because it does occur in wild birds. This is a map that shows the migratory flyways across the world. It is thought that this virus is spread by migratory birds to poultry populations. The countries with outbreaks in general have a high concentration of poultry. There is some concern because there are two of these flyways, as you can see, the East Atlanta Flyway which goes from the African continent up into the polar regions of Canada, and then the East Asia Flyway which comes up through Australia and comes into Canada and Alaska.

Now, it is unknown whether the virus will make a transition to the Western Hemisphere by these routes, but the routes suggest there could be some risk. And for that reason, there has been increased testing across the United States starting in Alaska with nearly 100,000 samples taken from live and dead wild birds, and 50,000 samples from water from high-risk waterfowl habitats to be tested in 2006 alone.

The World Health Organization has identified six levels of pandemic alert, and we are currently at level 3 with limited human-to-human transmission.

As of June 20, 2006, the World Health Organization has confirmed 228 human cases, 130 deaths. The disease was first found in Hong Kong in 1997, and 18 human cases were encountered in that outbreak, six of whom died, and there was significant poultry culling from that population. The disease was almost arrested at that point.

There is a high incidence of the disease in a few countries. Vietnam has had 40 percent of the human cases, and Indonesia has had 20 percent of the human cases. The problem is in Indonesia, the virus has not been contained compared to Vietnam. And Indonesia has had outbreaks since early 2004, and new outbreak reports occur with some frequency. As of June 20, the 51st case of human infection, which was fatal, was confirmed.

Let's look at a map of Indonesia. There has been a steady rise of reported cases and a high correlation between poultry populations and human outbreaks.

The little triangles on the map represent human cases. It is misleading because the triangles overlap so there are more cases than there are actually triangles because some of these cases do occur in clusters and are very close in a geographic footprint.

In some of the larger cities, notice how close some of the triangles occur. Indonesia is the fourth most populous country. In many ways Indonesia is still suffering from the tsunami that hit there the day after Christmas in 2004. In May they had a major earthquake in the central Java region with as many as a million and a half people left homeless, and Indonesia raises about a billion and a quarter chickens per year. That is about 7 percent of the global total. It has 70,000 villages spread across its 17,000 islands. Many of the poultry raised in Indonesia are raised in the backyards of people's houses, and about 80 percent of the country's 55 million households actually have close proximity to poultry. And that makes the presence of the disease in Indonesia a little more troubling.

A chart that is fairly busy but I think important to look at depicts some of the cases that have occurred in Indonesia. This is information that has been confirmed by scientists and field researchers from the World Health Organization. This is a recent family cluster that occurred in the Kubu Simbelang village in North Sumatra.

Many of the recent news headlines had to do with the fact concerning the avian flu virus may have become efficient in going from human to human, but the outbreak investigation showed that this is indeed, although there is a high number of cases, it is indeed what is known as a contained cluster, meaning no others, no health care workers, no neighboring villagers, were being infected.

The initial case, the index case of a 37-year-old woman, was most likely infected by her sick and dying backyard

chickens. She kept them indoors at night. No specimen was taken from this patient before she was buried so it cannot be confirmed that she was infected with the H5N1 virus. However, seven of her relatives did test positive for the virus. The relatives most likely became ill because of close contact with the initial illness. Six of the seven relatives have died, so currently limited inefficient human-to-human transmission of the H5N1 virus that causes the avian flu.

Another thing that is striking about this, we all think of flu as being an illness that strikes the very young or very old. But look at the age distribution in this family, in this village. Basically young healthy people were the ones that were infected. Now, it is not known whether that is significant or that just was the cluster that unfortunately got infected by that incident of infection, but it is striking that so many people were in the age group where you would think they would be young and healthy with a good immune system that could ward off this virus.

In general, 3 to 5, 10 days elapse between the time of symptoms to death with this illness.

Now several things separate the situation that is present today from that which existed in this country in 1918, and the first has been the introduction of antivirals and vaccines. Antiviral agents are able to actually attack part of the virus itself and work like an antibiotic and prevent the virus from replicating, and prevent the viral infection from being so severe.

Antivirals do have to be administered within the first 24 hours of the onset of symptoms in order to be effective. For that reason, we have to have an adequate stockpile of antiviral medications, and there has to be the distribution network to get the antiviral medications to the areas where they would be required should an outbreak occur.

Tamiflu is probably the most famous of the antivirals. Relenza is another one proprietary name for one of the antivirals. Again, if administered during the first 12 to 24 hours, these have the possibility of not stopping the illness, but moderating the course of the disease.

Vaccines are historically our major line of defense against viral illnesses. One of the problems we have is we have not had a great deal of secure vaccine manufacturing within our borders for a number of years. We have to have that ability to manufacture the vaccine within the United States.

One of the other problems is this virus is constantly evolving. It has not yet evolved from a state where it can go easily from human to human. There has been a vaccine developed to the current H5N1 virus, but if it changes yet again to the efficient human-to-human form, the vaccine may not be as effective. To some degree, you almost need to wait until the pandemic occurs before you can actually develop the vaccine.

But the good news is that there has been a vaccine that has been developed that seems safe. It does seem effective against the current strain of bird flu. One of the difficulties occurs, since we have no native immunity to this virus, it does take a lot of this vaccine to render someone immune to the virus. Normally you take a flu shot that is 15 micrograms of material to develop immunity. With this vaccine, it requires two doses of 90 micrograms in order to get someone to develop the appropriate immunity.

The other thing that has to happen, vaccine manufacturers that do exist manufacture vaccines by an old method, an egg-based method. If the disease is in chickens and we are having to cull poultry from the population, you don't want to depend upon an egg source for your vaccine, and newer cell-based technologies certainly need to be developed.

Surge capacity within the health care system is going to play a key role. We are going to have to be certain that we protect first line responders with whatever vaccine is available. If the virus hits, antivirals have to be available for first line responders. It is going to be important to rotate health care workers so they don't become overwhelmed in dealing with the disease, and we are going to have to offer mental support services, not just for health care workers, but for patients and their relatives who are charged with caring for them. This could be a disease that will take a very heavy emotional toll on the population.

In order to minimize the economic impact, we have to implement business continuity plans. This is being done in many communities. Certainly my communities back in Texas have looked into how they will handle some of the other things that local and county and State governments are supposed to do if faced with a pandemic outbreak.

Mr. Speaker, I will wrap this up. I do want to mention that I spent a day last week in Geneva with some individuals at the World Health Organization. Dr. Michael Ryan was kind enough to spend some time talking with me on the global perspective. I have been focused primarily on preparedness within this country, and Congress appropriately has been focused on preparedness in this country. But I want to make mention of some of the things being done by the World Health Organization in order to make certain that the virus is either arrested in its initial outbreak or that the disease is mitigated because people have been on top of it.

Dr. Ryan works at a place called the Strategic Health Operations Center that is part of the World Health Organization in Geneva. The purpose of that organization is to provide strategic support, in this country to provide that strategic support to the Department of Health and Human Services, but they also have a global response network that is responsive to the World Health

Organization as well as the CDC and Health and Human Services Department here in this country.

The concept is to control this virus at the source, and that is really what is one of the critical features of this. That is how they were able to gain control in Vietnam and Hong Kong. To some degree, culling of poultry populations is something that we may see more of as time goes by, as well as isolation and quarantine of infected individuals coupled with vaccination and antivirals.

Intelligence is of course a key to this whole process. And then verification of that intelligence, assessment of the situation on the ground and then a response to the situation as it occurs. All of these are parameters that the World Health Organization is monitoring through the Strategic Health Operation Center in Geneva.

Countries need to know that they just are not able to hide a problem like this and that officials at the World Health Organization consider this a reportable illness with or without the permission of the host government of the country. That, I think, is a terribly important step.

We have a lot of work yet to do in Congress as far as national preparedness. A good deal of work has already been done as far as the request for proposal for vaccines that went out earlier this year through Secretary Leavitt and the Department of Health and Human Services. A lot of preparatory work is taking place on the State, local, and county levels.

Every one of our committees in Congress has a role to play in preparedness for the possibility of this pandemic.

In the final analysis, is a pandemic going to occur? No one knows the answer to that question. It could be an illness of such severity that preparedness is something we are all going to wish we spent more time doing.

□ 2045

Or it may have come across as something more like the Y2K phenomenon where nothing much happens.

It will be in our best national interest, though, to focus on some of these preparedness aspects to work with some of our partners at the World Health Organization, be certain that we keep this virus under surveillance, be certain that we develop the vaccine capability, the surge capacity within our health care system and the development and stockpiling of antivirals within our country.

Mr. Speaker, you have been very indulgent.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. BECERRA (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for July 10.

Mr. GUTIERREZ (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today.

Mr. HINCHEY (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today.

Mr. McNULTY (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today and the balance of the week.

Ms. SLAUGHTER (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today.

Mr. TIAHRT (at the request of Mr. BOEHNER) for today on account of personal reasons.

Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia (at the request of Mr. BOEHNER) for today on account of personal reasons.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin (at the request of Mr. BOEHNER) for today from 12:30 p.m. and for the balance of the day on account of traveling with the President of the United States in Wisconsin.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Ms. WOOLSEY) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. EMANUEL, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. MCCARTHY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. WOOLSEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DEFAZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. PALLONE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. LYNCH, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. STUPAK, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. ALLEN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. McDERMOTT, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. McKINNEY, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. ADERHOLT) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. BILIRAKIS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. OTTER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey, for 5 minutes, today.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 8 o'clock and 48 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, July 12, 2006, at 10 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 8 of rule XII, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

8429. A letter from the Principal Deputy Under Secretary for Personnel and Readiness, Department of Defense, transmitting notification of the Department's intention to close the Defense commissary store at Naval Air Station (NAS) Keflavik, Iceland by August 31, 2006; to the Committee on Armed Services.

8430. A letter from the Under Secretary for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics, De-

partment of Defense, transmitting a report identifying, for each of the armed forces (other than the Coast Guard) and each Defense Agency, the percentage of funds that were expended during the preceding two fiscal years for performance of depot-level maintenance and repair workloads by the public and private sectors, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 2466(d)(1); to the Committee on Armed Services.

8431. A letter from the Under Secretary for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics, Department of Defense, transmitting certification that the Global Hawk program has been restructured, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 2433; to the Committee on Armed Services.

8432. A letter from the Under Secretary for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics, Department of Defense, transmitting certification that the National Polar-orbiting Operational Environmental Satellite System program has been restructured, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 2433; to the Committee on Armed Services.

8433. A letter from the Under Secretary for Personnel and Readiness, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter on the approved retirement of Lieutenant General Henry P. Osman, United States Marine Corps, and his advancement to the grade of lieutenant general on the retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

8434. A letter from the Director, International Cooperation, Department of Defense, transmitting pursuant to Section 27(f) of the Arms Export Control Act and Section 1(f) of Executive Order 11958, a copy of Transmittal No. 15-06 which informs of an intent to sign the Defensive Aid Systems Project Arrangement between the United States and the United Kingdom; to the Committee on International Relations.

8435. A letter from the Assistant Legal Adviser for Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Copies of international agreements, other than treaties, entered into by the United States, pursuant to 1 U.S.C. 112b(a); to the Committee on International Relations.

8436. A letter from the Vice President, Office of External Relations, CHF International, transmitting the 2005 Annual Report entitled, "Pathways to Stability"; to the Committee on International Relations.

8437. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the Department's 2005 Annual Report to Congress on Peacekeeping; to the Committee on International Relations.

8438. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting consistent with the Authorization for Use of Military Force Against Iraq Resolution of 2002 (Pub. L. 107-243), the Authorization for the Use of Force Against Iraq Resolution (Pub. L. 102-1), and in order to keep the Congress fully informed, a report prepared by the Department of State for the April 15, 2006-June 15, 2006 reporting period including matters relating to post-liberation Iraq under Section 7 of the Iraq Liberation Act of 1998 (Pub. L. 105-338); to the Committee on International Relations.

8439. A letter from the Acting U.S. Global AIDS Coordinator, Department of State, transmitting a report on the President's Emergency Plan for AIDS Relief: Food and Nutrition for People Living with HIV/AIDS, as requested in House Report 109-152, accompanying H.R. 3057; to the Committee on International Relations.

8440. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Treasury, transmitting a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to Sudan that was declared in Executive Order 13067 of November 3, 1997, as required by section 401(c) of the National Emergencies Act, 50 U.S.C. 1641(c), and section 204(c) of the International Emergency

Economic Powers Act, 50 U.S.C. 1703(c), and pursuant to Executive Order 13313 of July 31, 2003; to the Committee on International Relations.

8441. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting as required by section 401(c) of the National Emergencies Act, 50 U.S.C. 1641(c), and section 204(c) of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act, 50 U.S.C. 1703(c), and pursuant to Executive Order 13313 of July 31, 2003, a six-month periodic report of the national emergency with respect to the Western Balkans that was declared in Executive Order 13219 of June 26, 2001; to the Committee on International Relations.

8442. A letter from the Chairman of the Board, Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, transmitting the Annual Report of the Corporation, which includes the Corporation's operational and financial results as of September 30, 2005, pursuant to 29 U.S.C. 1308; to the Committee on Government Reform.

8443. A letter from the Chief Human Capital Officer, Corporation for National & Community Service, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

8444. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's strategic Plan for FY 2005-2010; to the Committee on Government Reform.

8445. A letter from the Assistant Director, Executive & Political Personnel, Department of Defense, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

8446. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Administration and Management, Chief Acquisition Officer, Department of Labor, transmitting the Department's report on the amount of acquisitions made from entities that manufacture the articles, materials, or supplies outside the United States in Fiscal Year 2005, pursuant to Public Law 108-447, section 641; to the Committee on Government Reform.

8447. A letter from the Attorney, Department of Transportation, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

8448. A letter from the Assistant Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's report on the amount of acquisitions made from entities that manufacture the articles, materials, or supplies outside the United States in Fiscal Year 2005, pursuant to Public Law 108-447, section 641; to the Committee on Government Reform.

8449. A letter from the First Vice President & Controller, Federal Home Loan Bank of Atlanta, transmitting the 2005 management report and statements on system of internal controls of the Federal Home Loan Bank of Atlanta, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 9106; to the Committee on Government Reform.

8450. A letter from the President, Federal Home Loan Bank of Cincinnati, transmitting the 2005 management report and statements on system of internal controls of the Federal Home Loan Bank of Cincinnati, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 9106; to the Committee on Government Reform.

8451. A letter from the President and Chief Executive Officer, Federal Home Loan Bank of Des Moines, transmitting the 2005 management report and statements on system of internal controls of the Federal Home Loan Bank of Des Moines, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 9106; to the Committee on Government Reform.

8452. A letter from the President and Chief Executive Officer, Federal Home Loan Bank

of Indianapolis, transmitting the 2005 Statements on System of Internal Controls of the Federal Home Loan Bank of Indianapolis, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 9106; to the Committee on Government Reform.

8453. A letter from the President & CEO, Overseas Private Investment Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's FY 2005 Annual Report required by Section 203 of the Notification and Federal Antidiscrimination and Retaliation Act of 2002, Pub. L. 107-174; to the Committee on Government Reform.

8454. A letter from the Chief, Border Security Regulations Branch, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Closing of the Port of Noyes, Minnesota, and Extension of the Limits of the Port of Pembina, North Dakota [CBP Dec. 06-15; USCBP-2005-0001] received June 6, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8455. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Regulated Navigation Area; East Rockaway Inlet to Atlantic Beach Bridge, Nassau County, Long Island, New York [CGD01-05-106] (RIN: 1625-AA11) received June 20, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8456. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Anchorage Regulations; Port of New York and Vicinity [CGD01-05-101] (RIN: 1625-AA01) (Previously reported as RIN: 1625-AA98) received June 20, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8457. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Drawbridge Operation Regulations; Massalina Bayou, Panama City, FL [CGD08-06-016] (RIN: 1625-AA09) received June 20, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8458. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Drawbridge Operation Regulations; Chelsea River, Chelsea, MA [CGD01-06-024] (RIN: 1625-AA09) received June 20, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8459. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Cooper River, Hog Island Channel, Charleston SC [COTP Charleston 06-003] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received June 20, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8460. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zones: Fireworks Displays in the Captain of the Port Portland Zone [CGD13-06-009] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received June 20, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8461. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Security Zone; Severn River and College Creek, Annapolis, Maryland [CGD05-06-052] (RIN: 1625-AA87) received June 20, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8462. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department

of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Security Zone; Severn River and College Creek, Annapolis, Maryland [CGD05-06-052] (RIN: 1625-AA87) received June 20, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8463. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Special Local Regulations for Marine Events; Pasquotank River, Elizabeth City, North Carolina [CGD05-06-023] (RIN: 1625-AA08) received June 20, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8464. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Special Local Regulations for Marine Events; Rappahannock River, Essex County, Westmoreland County, Layton, Virginia [CGD05-06-024] (RIN: 1625-AA08) received June 20, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8465. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Special Local Regulation for Marine Events; Nanticoke River, Sharptown, MD [CGD05-06-020] (RIN: 1625-AA08) received June 20, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8466. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Norfolk Harbor Entrance Reach, Chesapeake Bay, VA [CGD05-06-051] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received June 20, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8467. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Thunder on the Niagara, The Niagara River at Gratwick Riverside Park, North Tonawanda, NY [CGD09-06-029] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received June 20, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8468. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Cooper River, Hog Island Channel, Charleston, SC [COTP Charleston 06-003] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received June 20, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8469. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Tarague Basin and Adjacent Waters, GU [COTP Guam 06-008] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received June 20, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8470. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Rockets for Schools, Sheboygan, WI [CGD09-06-024] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received June 20, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8471. A letter from the Program Analyst, NHTSA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Federal Motor Vehicle Safety Standards; Child Restraint Systems [Docket No. NHTSA-2006-24980] (RIN: 2127-AI66) received

June 20, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8472. A letter from the Assistant Chief Counsel, Hazardous Materials, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Hazardous Materials: Requirements for UN Cylinders [Docket No. PHMSA-2005-17463 (HM-220E)] (RIN: 2137-AD91) received June 6, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8473. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Honeywell International Inc. ALF502L Series and ALF502R Series Turbofan Engines [Docket No. 92-ANE-34-AD; Amendment 39-14584; AD-2006-09-13] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 20, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8474. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of Organization Designation Authorization Program [Docket No. FAA-2003-16685] (RIN: 2120-AH79) received June 20, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8475. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Model A310-200 and -300 Series Airplanes [Docket No. FAA-2006-24104; Directorate Identifier 2005-NM-231-AD; Amendment 39-14595; AD 2006-10-11] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 20, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8476. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Empresa Brasileira de Aeronautica S.A. (EMBRAER) Model EMB-120, -120ER, -120FC, -120QC, and -120RT Airplanes in Operation [Docket No. FAA-2006-24120; Directorate Identifier 2006-NM-021-AD; Amendment 39-14593; AD 2006-10-09] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 20, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8477. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Learjet Model 45 Airplanes [Docket No. FAA-2006-24792; Directorate Identifier 2006-NM-102-AD; Amendment 39-14599; AD 2006-10-15] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 20, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8478. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Model A330-223, -321, -322, and -323 Airplanes [Docket No. FAA-2004-19982; Directorate Identifier 2004-NM-142-AD; Amendment 39-14597; AD 2006-10-13] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 20, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8479. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Revision of Class E Airspace; Big Lake, AK [Docket No. FAA-2006-23927; Airspace Docket No. 06-AAL-11] received June 6, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8480. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of VOR Federal Airway V-623; NJ and NY [Docket No. FAA-2005-23424; Airspace

Docket No. 05-AEA-23] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received June 6, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8481. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Revision of Class E Airspace; Atkasuk, AK [Docket No. FAA-2006-23710; Airspace Docket No. 06-AAL-03] received June 6, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8482. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, Weather Takeoff Minimums; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No. 30496; Amdt. No. 3168] received June 6, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8483. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Modification and Revocation of Restricted Areas R-3007A, B, C, D, and E; Townsend, GA [Docket No. FAA-2003-16531; Airspace Docket No. 96-ASO-10] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received June 6, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8484. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No. 30497; Amdt. No. 3169] received June 6, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8485. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Special Local Regulations for Marine Events; Onslow Bay, Beaufort Inlet, Morehead City State Port, Beaufort Harbor and Taylor Creek, North Carolina [CGD05-06-015] (RIN: 1625-AA08) received June 20, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia: Committee on Government Reform. H.R. 4855. A bill to amend the District of Columbia College Access Act of 1999 to reauthorize for 5 additional years the public and private school tuition assistance programs established under the Act (Rept. 109-553). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. BOREN:

H.R. 5755. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to direct the Secretary of Defense to prohibit the unauthorized use of names and images of members of the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BEAUPREZ:

H.R. 5756. A bill to provide additional authority to the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of the Interior to implement

hazardous fuel reduction projects in the State of Colorado in response to dangerous fuel levels and insect infestations in forested Federal land in Colorado, to extend the maximum duration of stewardship contracts carried out in Colorado, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend the credit for electricity produced from biomass, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, and in addition to the Committees on Resources, and Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BROWN of Ohio (for himself and Mr. SCHIFF):

H.R. 5757. A bill to amend title 11 of the United States Code with respect to converting chapter 7 cases of certain debtors who are victims of identity theft; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FOLEY (for himself, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. SIMMONS, and Ms. BORDALLO):

H.R. 5758. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide that World War II merchant mariners who were awarded the Mariners Medal shall be provided eligibility for Department of Veterans Affairs health care on the same basis as veterans who have been awarded the Purple Heart; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Ms. HARRIS:

H.R. 5759. A bill to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to establish a Directorate of Emergency Management, to prevent waste, fraud, and abuse in the Directorate, to codify certain existing functions of the Department of Homeland Security, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committees on Homeland Security, Energy and Commerce, International Relations, the Judiciary, and House Administration, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. NUNES:

H.R. 5760. A bill to fulfill President Clinton's commitments made as part of the designation of the Giant Sequoia National Monument by presidential proclamation to provide a transition from the timber sale program in effect before the designation to the more restrictive management anticipated for the national monument, to promote the Kings River Research Project in the Sierra National Forest, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, and in addition to the Committee on Resources, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SANDERS:

H.R. 5761. A bill to amend the Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982 to improve the material control and accounting and data management systems used by civilian nuclear power reactors to better account for spent nuclear fuel and reduce the risks associated with the handling of those materials; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. TERRY:

H.R. 5762. A bill to amend the Fairness to Contact Lens Consumers Act with respect to the availability of contact lenses; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. WOLF:

H.R. 5763. A bill to authorize the exchange, between the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Transportation, of administrative jurisdiction of Federal land at the George Washington Memorial Parkway in

McLean, Virginia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Resources, and in addition to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska:

H.R. 5764. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain Forest Service land to the city of Coffman Cove, Alaska; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. GOHMERT:

H.J. Res. 91. A joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to marriage; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FOSSELLA (for himself, Mr. MICA, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. KUHL of New York, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. NADLER, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. TIBERI, and Mr. TOWNS):

H. Res. 908. A resolution congratulating Italy on winning the 2006 Federation Internationale de Football Association (FIFA) World Cup; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mr. PRICE of Georgia (for himself, Mrs. KELLY, and Mr. SCOTT of Georgia):

H. Res. 909. A resolution encouraging the United States financial services industry to develop, test, and implement systemic plans to address the challenges and risks posed by pandemic or bioterrorism events to the national and international economies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 147: Mr. TIBERI.
H.R. 354: Mr. SAXTON and Ms. PRYCE of Ohio.
H.R. 379: Mr. GRIJALVA and Mr. OWENS.
H.R. 550: Ms. BEAN.
H.R. 602: Mr. STUPAK.
H.R. 626: Mr. SMITH of Texas.
H.R. 874: Mr. BOOZMAN.
H.R. 994: Mr. REGULA and Mr. MELANCON.
H.R. 1000: Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota.
H.R. 1020: Mr. HINCHEY.
H.R. 1050: Mr. CLAY.
H.R. 1108: Mr. ROSS.
H.R. 1227: Mr. HOEKSTRA.
H.R. 1298: Ms. CARSON.
H.R. 1322: Mr. CONYERS.
H.R. 1329: Mr. JONES of North Carolina.
H.R. 1351: Mr. WALSH.
H.R. 1372: Mr. GRIJALVA.
H.R. 1376: Mr. MOORE of Kansas.
H.R. 1384: Mr. WAMP, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, and Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin.
H.R. 1849: Mr. LIPINSKI.

H.R. 1898: Mr. WALDEN of Oregon and Mr. WHITFIELD.
H.R. 1955: Ms. HOOLEY.
H.R. 2039: Mr. UDALL of Colorado and Mr. MCKEON.
H.R. 2051: Mrs. CAPPS.
H.R. 2134: Mr. OLVER.
H.R. 2178: Mr. CAPUANO and Mr. GONZALEZ.
H.R. 2206: Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. RUSH, and Mr. ALLEN.
H.R. 2393: Mr. TIAHRT.
H.R. 2421: Mr. ALLEN and Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.
H.R. 2561: Mr. PAYNE.
H.R. 2793: Mr. STUPAK.
H.R. 2808: Mr. NUNES, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. HOLT, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. MCCAUL of Texas, Mr. CHANDLER, Mr. CARNAHAN, Mr. SHAW, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. HEFLEY, Mr. ETHERIDGE, Mr. DAVIS of Florida, and Mr. DEFAZIO.
H.R. 2861: Mrs. LOWEY.
H.R. 2963: Mr. KIND.
H.R. 3248: Mr. CARDIN.
H.R. 3413: Mr. LEACH.
H.R. 3427: Mr. ALLEN and Mr. KILDEE.
H.R. 3492: Mr. NADLER.
H.R. 3579: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.
H.R. 3616: Mr. PICKERING, Mr. LOBIONDO, Ms. GRANGER, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, and Mr. RAMSTAD.
H.R. 3715: Mr. BACHUS.
H.R. 3762: Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts and Mr. RANGEL.
H.R. 3795: Mr. SHIMKUS and Mrs. MILLER of Michigan.
H.R. 3875: Mr. ALLEN, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. FILNER, and Mr. RANGEL.
H.R. 3949: Ms. HART.
H.R. 4005: Mr. SWEENEY.
H.R. 4059: Mr. BROWN of Ohio and Mr. ALLEN.
H.R. 4201: Mr. KILDEE.
H.R. 4217: Mrs. SCHMIDT.
H.R. 4264: Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida.
H.R. 4298: Mr. SNYDER and Mr. CROWLEY.
H.R. 4381: Ms. HART.
H.R. 4403: Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota and Mr. COSTA.
H.R. 4537: Mr. CONYERS and Mr. GRIJALVA.
H.R. 4597: Mr. LEACH, Mr. LUCAS, and Ms. WATERS.
H.R. 4772: Mr. CANNON.
H.R. 4800: Mr. ENGEL and Mr. MARKEY.
H.R. 4854: Mr. PAUL and Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota.
H.R. 4873: Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia.
H.R. 4927: Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. TERRY, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. PAYNE, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. CARDIN, and Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky.
H.R. 4961: Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mrs. MUSGRAVE, Mrs. KELLY, and Mrs. DRAKE.
H.R. 5013: Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin, Mr. BOOZMAN, and Mr. THORNBERRY.
H.R. 5022: Mr. PAYNE, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. DOGGETT, and Ms. MCKINNEY.
H.R. 5047: Mr. UDALL of Colorado.
H.R. 5050: Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota.
H.R. 5099: Miss MCMORRIS.
H.R. 5102: Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota.
H.R. 5118: Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. TERRY, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. GOHMERT, and Mr. GORDON.
H.R. 5134: Mr. YUHN and Mr. HERGER.
H.R. 5173: Mr. KUHL of New York.
H.R. 5212: Mr. ISRAEL.

H.R. 5233: Mr. RANGEL.
H.R. 5282: Mr. MCKEON.
H.R. 5291: Mrs. MYRICK.
H.R. 5337: Mr. NUNES.
H.R. 5381: Mr. WHITFIELD.
H.R. 5388: Mr. JACKSON of Illinois.
H.R. 5390: Mr. MCCOTTER.
H.R. 5392: Mr. SHAYS.
H.R. 5396: Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. MCCOTTER, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, and Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.
H.R. 5470: Mr. TERRY.
H.R. 5482: Mr. BERMAN.
H.R. 5496: Mr. PAYNE.
H.R. 5499: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia and Ms. WATSON.
H.R. 5542: Mr. COSTA.
H.R. 5551: Mr. ROGERS of Michigan.
H.R. 5555: Mr. MARSHALL.
H.R. 5563: Mr. JACKSON of Illinois.
H.R. 5584: Mr. ETHERIDGE.
H.R. 5598: Ms. SLAUGHTER.
H.R. 5615: Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.
H.R. 5623: Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. HOLDEN, and Mr. OLVER.
H.R. 5671: Mr. BISHOP of New York.
H.R. 5674: Mr. DOGGETT.
H.R. 5680: Mr. MCCOTTER, Ms. WATSON, Mr. HONDA, and Mr. SMITH of Washington.
H.R. 5682: Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. SESSIONS, and Mr. CONAWAY.
H.R. 5685: Mr. CROWLEY.
H.R. 5706: Mr. KIND.
H.R. 5733: Mr. MCCOTTER, Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin, Mr. LEWIS of California, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, and Ms. BORDALLO.
H.R. 5735: Ms. SLAUGHTER.
H.R. 5744: Mr. SOUDER.
H.R. 5752: Mr. LANGEVIN.
H.J. Res. 73: Mr. MEEK of Florida.
H. Con. Res. 50: Mr. HAYES and Mr. SIMPSON.
H. Con. Res. 222: Mr. MEEHAN.
H. Con. Res. 384: Mr. BOEHLERT.
H. Con. Res. 390: Mr. SESSIONS.
H. Con. Res. 401: Ms. MCKINNEY.
H. Con. Res. 420: Mr. JACKSON of Illinois.
H. Res. 533: Mr. KENNEDY of Minnesota, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. SIMMONS, Mr. KUHL of New York, Miss McMorris, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, Mr. HAYWORTH, and Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida.
H. Res. 745: Mr. LANTOS.
H. Res. 759: Mr. TOWNS.
H. Res. 790: Ms. PELOSI, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mr. CLAY, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. OWENS, and Mr. WYNN.
H. Res. 859: Mr. LEWIS of Georgia.
H. Res. 863: Mr. JACKSON of Illinois.
H. Res. 880: Mr. GERLACH.
H. Res. 884: Mr. CLYBURN.
H. Res. 900: Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. PASTOR, Mr. CARNAHAN, and Mr. HOLDEN.
H. Res. 901: Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. ISRAEL, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. McNULTY, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. OWENS, Mr. ROSS, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. STARK, Mr. STRICKLAND, Mr. PAYNE, and Mr. JEFFERSON.
H. Res. 903: Mr. SOUDER and Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas.